

APR 8 - 1932

*Bulletin*  
*of the*  
*Association of American*  
*Colleges*

**SOCIETY AND THE COLLEGE**

**MEASURING STUDENTS AND MEASURING  
COLLEGES**

**REPORTS TO THE EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL  
MEETING**

**THE OFFICIAL RECORDS**

*March, 1932*

54.01

# *Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges*

---

VOLUME XVIII

MARCH, 1932

NUMBER 1

---

Edited by

ROBERT L. KELLY

Executive Secretary of the Association

MARTHA T. BOARDMAN

Editorial Assistant

ARCHIE M. PALMER

Contributing Editor

Published by the

*Association of American Colleges*

Lime and Green Sts., Lancaster, Pa.

*Editorial Offices*

111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

March, May, November, December

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

## OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1932-33

**PRESIDENT:** President Irving Maurer, Beloit College

**VICE-PRESIDENT:** President F. L. McVey, University of Kentucky

**EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:** Dr. Robert L. Kelly, New York City

**TREASURER:** President William M. Lewis, Lafayette College

**CUSTODIAN OF FUNDS:** Bank of New York and Trust Company, New York City

**ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:** President E. H. Wilkins, Oberlin College; President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University; President W. P. Few, Duke University; Dean William Cunningham, St. Thomas College

### REPRESENTATION ON STANDING COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

#### AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION:

President Guy E. Snavely, Birmingham-Southern College (one year)

President J. Edgar Park, Wheaton College (Mass.) (two years)

Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, University of Buffalo (three years)

#### COMMITTEE ON FORM OF CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION:

Dean Raymond Walters, Swarthmore College, *Chairman*

Chancellor S. P. Capen, University of Buffalo

Dr. Frederick J. Kelly, United States Office of Education

#### NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION:

President W. M. Lewis, Lafayette College

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, Association of American Colleges

President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College

President R. E. Blackwell, Randolph-Macon College

Rector James H. Ryan, The Catholic University of America

#### NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON STANDARD REPORTS FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING:

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College

Professor Floyd Reeves, The University of Chicago

President E. E. Rall, North Central College

Ass't Secretary, J. C. Christensen, University of Michigan

Controller G. C. Wintringer, Princeton University

Professor E. S. Evenden, Teachers College

President George F. Zook, University of Akron

#### NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL:

Professor Arthur H. Compton, The University of Chicago, 1932-33

#### COMMISSION ON ATHLETICS:

President Thomas S. Gates, University of Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

President Daniel L. Marsh, Boston University

President W. M. Lewis, Lafayette College



President E. H. Wilkins, Oberlin College  
Acting President J. M. Newcomb, University of Virginia

COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN FINE  
ARTS:

President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, *Chairman*  
President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation  
President John Erskine, Juilliard School of Music  
Mr. J. Fredrick Larson, Dartmouth College  
President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College  
Sister Anna Goulet, College of St. Catherine

COMMISSION ON THE COST OF COLLEGE EDUCATION:

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, *Chairman*  
Controller C. C. Wintringer, Princeton University  
Controller Lloyd Morey, University of Illinois  
Auditor N. C. Plimpton, The University of Chicago  
Secretary Alex. H. Sands, Jr., The Duke Endowment  
Auditor T. L. Hungate, Teachers College, Columbia University  
President G. B. Oxnam, DePauw University

COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL SURVEYS:

President David A. Robertson, Goucher College, *Chairman*  
President George F. Zook, University of Akron  
Executive Secretary M. C. Huntley, Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States

COMMISSION ON ENLISTMENT AND TRAINING OF COLLEGE TEACHERS:

President Albert Britt, Knox College, *Chairman*  
President J. R. Angell, Yale University  
President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College  
President H. P. Rainey, Bucknell University  
President W. L. Boe, St. Olaf's College

COMMISSION ON FACULTY AND STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP:

President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College, *Chairman*  
Dean C. S. Boucher, The University of Chicago  
Dean Julian Park, University of Buffalo  
President C. D. Gray, Bates College  
President Katharine Blunt, Connecticut College

COMMISSION ON PERMANENT AND TRUST FUNDS:

Dr. A. W. Anthony, Trustee, Bates College, *Chairman*  
President Rees E. Tulloss, Wittenberg College  
Ass't-Treasurer Raymond L. Thompson, University of Rochester  
President James Ross McCain, Agnes Scott College

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS:

The President, *ex officio*, the Executive Secretary, *ex officio*, the Treasurer, *ex officio*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<i>Editorial</i> .....	5
SOCIETY AND THE COLLEGE	
Society and the College, <i>Ernest H. Wilkins</i> .....	7
Message to the Cincinnati Meeting, <i>Lawrence Pearsall Jacks</i> .....	26
Education and Depression, <i>Charles P. Taft, 2d</i> .....	29
Cooperation between Art Museums and Colleges, <i>Walter H. Siple</i> .....	39
MEASURING STUDENTS Versus MEASURING COLLEGES	
Vital Educational Measures Applicable to Colleges, <i>Samuel P. Capen</i> .....	45
The Work of the Committee on Personnel of the American Council on Education, <i>Herbert E. Hawkes</i> .....	54
THE ACTIVITIES OF THE YEAR	
The Annual Report of the Executive Committee and Executive Secretary, <i>Robert L. Kelly</i> .....	59
The Annual Report of the Treasurer for 1931, <i>William Mather Lewis</i> .....	66
The Present Financial Status of the College, <i>Alfred Williams Anthony</i> .....	70
The Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, <i>James L. McConaughy</i> .....	82
Educational Surveys, <i>Frank L. McVey</i> .....	91
Proposed Form of Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, <i>Raymond Walters</i> .....	96
College Athletics and the Character-Building Function of Higher Education, <i>Thomas S. Gates</i> .....	103
THE OFFICIAL RECORDS	
The Sectional Luncheon Conferences .....	113
Minutes of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting, <i>Archie M. Palmer</i> .....	121
Members of the Association. 1932.....	131
Constitution and By-Laws of the Association.....	144
Former Presidents of the Association.....	146
<i>Appendix</i>	
1. Enlistment and Training of College Teachers: Tables.....	148
This BULLETIN is indexed in <i>The Education Index</i> .	

## EDITORIAL

### THE ANNUAL MEETING, 1933

Atlantic City has been chosen as the next meeting place of the Association and allied associations and agencies, the dates of the Association meeting being January 12 and 13. The Chelsea Hotel will be the headquarters for the meetings and has made special rates in view of the nature of the organizations and the present financial situation. We believe that these are the best rates that have ever been made by a hotel during the history of the organization. Definite announcements will be made by direct mail to Association members and others interested.

Each year in the history of the Association marks an advance over preceding years. It can confidently be asserted that progress is being made, even if slowly, in the science and art of college administration. Advance steps were taken at Cincinnati in the reports of the officers and the several chairmen of the Commissions and Committees. Each report is short and says much in a few words.

The Association owes a debt of gratitude to President Wilkins for his trenchant analysis of college functions and his striking if not even revolutionary suggestions for changes in college organization. His paper will receive the careful study of a multitude of students of college administration.

Inherent in the constitution and soul of the Association of American Colleges is an appreciation of values as contrasted with a desire to establish and administer forms. From its inception the Association has steered clear of the effort to measure colleges by objective standards. Its policy has always been one, within reasonable bounds, of inclusiveness in the hope and expectation that fine gold may be discovered even in unexpected places. The Association has emphasized achievement and has sought methods to stimulate it and to evaluate it. Dean Hawkes and Chancellor Capen pushed this consideration into hitherto unoccupied territory this year. Both proclaimed, in effect or in words, the measurement of students as more significant than the measurement of colleges.

The actual testing of materials is of primary consideration. The college is judged finally by its product. The Pennsylvania

Study by the Carnegie Foundation, the application of the Sophomore Tests of the American Council on Education, the Comprehensive Examination Study of the Association of American Colleges, all look to the same end—the quality of the product. No college certainly can object to this procedure.

Of course, it cannot and must not be said that any one (or all) of these agencies is now able accurately and comprehensively to test materials and evaluate products. It is enough to say that these are their objectives and that they have gone a little farther on the way than they had gone before.

#### THE COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION STUDY

Our Study of Comprehensive Examinations, being conducted by Dr. Edward S. Jones, is progressing splendidly. Over forty colleges east of the Mississippi have already been visited and Dr. Jones is now covering the western territory. He plans to visit approximately fifteen colleges west of the Mississippi. The interest and cooperation received from institutions throughout the country has been most gratifying.

#### MAY ISSUE OF THE BULLETIN

The May issue of the BULLETIN will be featured by a symposium on the series of topics considered in the luncheon conferences at Cincinnati. The contributors are Dean Gauss of Princeton, President Blunt of Connecticut College, President Lewis of Lafayette, President Rainey of Bucknell, President Wriston of Lawrence, President Cowling of Carleton, Dr. E. S. Jones, Director of the Association's Comprehensive Examination Study, of the University of Buffalo and Dr. Alfred Williams Anthony of the Association's Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds.

Further reports will appear also on the "Smaller College" Study, the first sections of which are to be found in the December, 1931, issue. College officers and teachers will wish to keep track of all these reports and preserve them as a unified book of reference.—R. L. K.

## SOCIETY AND THE COLLEGE

### The Presidential Address

ERNEST H. WILKINS

PRESIDENT OF OBERLIN COLLEGE

THE honor which you gave me a year ago has led me to desire to do for you in return the best that I could do. In anticipation of this meeting I have spent a large part of my time throughout the year in the endeavor to think through the general problem of college education in America. The results of that endeavor are too extensive in bulk to be presented fully here.<sup>1</sup> I shall simply try, in the fifty minutes for which I plan to speak, to review certain considerations which seem to bear significantly upon the problem, and to outline in a very general way the types of college education which seem to be called for by the needs of society and to be feasible under present conditions. For the sake of brevity I shall omit many qualifying phrases which would naturally appear in a fuller treatment.

### I

Extraordinary increases have taken place in this country, during the last forty years, in the number of boys and girls going to high school, and in the number of high school graduates going to college. These increases, taken together, constitute one of the most striking phenomena in recent American history.

In 1890 the number of high school pupils was about 200,000: today it is approximately four and one-half million. In 1890 the proportion of boys and girls of high school age who were actually in the high schools was about one-twentieth: today it is about one-half.

The attempt to give education on the high school level to so great a proportion of our youth is without precedent. It is the expression of a surging democracy of spirit which is more important than any outward political form. It is fraught with consequences of the utmost promise and of the utmost peril for democracy and for civilization itself. It is perilous—for we shall

<sup>1</sup> They will appear in my book, *The College and Society*, which is to be published in April by the Century Company.

soon be putting the dangerous power of a little knowledge into the hands of the majority of our population. It is promising—in so far as our faith in knowledge and in humanity may be justified.

The increase in the number of high school students has resulted, naturally, in an increase in the number of those who have gone on to college. Other forces, also, have operated to the same effect. In 1890 the total number of students in college was less than 70,000; today it is over 700,000.

What does this extraordinary increase really mean? It means, primarily, this: that the number of high school graduates who want and can afford *further general education* (that is, further education which is not specifically occupational) has enormously increased. It does not mean that the existing college is the right type of institution to provide further general education for all of them.

The existing college was designed for the higher education of a group much more restricted in size and much more homogeneous in educational purpose. It was in origin, and it is still, essentially a pre-professional institution. It was created, three hundred years ago, primarily for the training of a learned ministry; and until the latter part of the nineteenth century it was, in fact, mainly concerned with the pre-professional training of ministers, lawyers, and physicians.

In the course of the nineteenth century the constituency of the college widened somewhat through the coming of more and more men who were not headed for one of the learned professions: but most of these men (though not all) shared the intellectual interests of their pre-professional companions.

College education was opened to women about a hundred years ago. It might be thought that their presence in college would have tended to modify the pre-professional program; but they were for a long time so concerned to demonstrate their ability to do exactly what men could do that they raised little question as to the general appropriateness of the tasks set before them. And the professions did gradually yield them entrance.

All in all, the college program was fairly well adapted, until 1900 or thereabouts, for the purposes of a considerable majority of its students—though the number of those for whom it was not well adapted was steadily increasing.

As the increase in the number of students going to college became more and more swift, however, conditions changed in this respect. Students came in greater and greater numbers who had no thought of entering the professional or the graduate schools. Many of them, still, shared the intellectual interests of their pre-professional companions, but more and more of them did not. The men in this latter and more swiftly increasing group were in general headed for some sort of non-professional employment; the women for some sort of non-professional employment or for home life. The program of the existing college was not planned for such students. It is by no means without value for them, but it is in fact not well adapted for their needs. And they have figured so largely in the recent swift increase that they probably outnumber already those students whose interests are definitely or in effect pre-professional.

Up from the high schools today, then, there are coming two rather easily distinguishable groups of young men and women who seek further general education: a group which may, for convenience, be called the pre-professional group, for whom the existing college is fairly well adapted; and a still more rapidly increasing group, which may, for convenience, be called the non-professional group, for whom the existing college is not well adapted.

Is it a good thing that students of this second group should go to college? If the question be asked in that form, and in terms of the existing college, the answer may well be doubtful or negative; but the question should be asked in a more searching form. *From the point of view of society as a whole, the question is really not whether these students should go to the existing college: it is whether these students, seeking further general education beyond the high school, should have it: and, if so, what the character of that further general education should be.*

Is it a good thing in itself, from the point of view of society, that these students should receive further general education—*supposing it to be adapted to their needs?*

Upon that supposition, the answer should certainly be in the affirmative. That same faith in knowledge and in humanity which justifies the provision of high school education for millions of boys and girls would seem fully to justify the provision of



appropriate further general education for all those high school graduates who desire it and are competent to profit by it. In the largest possible provision of appropriate education, indeed, lies the best hope of society—both because the number of those who are well qualified to play their parts in society is thereby increased, and because there is thus a better chance for the discovery and the development of those who have it in them to become, in some significant measure, leaders for society.

The problem of higher education in America is twofold. It comprises the perpetual problem of the more perfect adaptation of the existing college for the pre-professional students for whom the existing college is already fairly well adapted; and the new problem of the provision of appropriate further general education—in a new type of college—for the still more swiftly increasing group of non-professional students. I shall deal first with the new problem, which is in reality the simpler problem of the two.

## II

What sort of further education is really appropriate for the increasing numbers of high school graduates who, without having pre-professional or equivalent interests, are nevertheless to continue their general education beyond the high school level?

“Appropriate” means “desirable, for these students, from the point of view of society”; and, from the point of view of society, that education is desirable for them which will enable them to play their parts well as members of society.

What parts will they have to play? What are the main fields of social living in which men and women act?

There are five such fields, presently to be considered in some detail: home life, the field of earning, citizenship, leisure, and philosophy and religion. In so far as men and women live well in these five fields, they will satisfy the needs of society. In so far as they live less than well, they will be insignificant, or detrimental to society.

To live well in these fields means to carry on the relations and the experiences concerned with intelligence and with good will. The general social task of education is to develop the requisite intelligence and to make it specifically effective in these several fields, and to develop also the desired good will.



To the type of institution in which, for the students now concerned, such education is to be carried on, there may be given the name of the General College.

Let us next consider the five fields of social living, with some thought, in each case, as to the responsibilities and opportunities of the General College.

#### HOME LIFE

The biologically basic field of home life is still the most immediate and the most critically important of all. The majority of men and women, through marriage, are centrally concerned with it—most fully, of course, if marriage brings parenthood. But even those who do not marry usually maintain some significant filial or fraternal or other type of home relationship.

The field of home life includes, of course, the whole economy of the home, exceedingly varied, difficult, exacting, full of possibilities which range from disease to health, from discomfort to well-being, from ugliness to beauty.

But home life is, more vitally, a matter of human relationships at close range. Relationships of presence; relationships of thought, and work, and leisure; relationships of experience intimately shared, or of experience reported and shared vicariously. Relationships of husband and wife, relationships with children, relationships with those who are older or infirm, with brothers and sisters, with others who may dwell under the same roof. No relationships fill more of life; none are more rich in possibilities; none lead more certainly, if they go wrong, into the depths of tragedy.

Preparation for home life is in point of fact very largely neglected; and its conduct is left to what is remembered of family tradition, applied and supplemented through the primitive method of trial and error—with the result of infinite unhappiness and of grave danger to the whole fabric of society.

The existing college itself receives, in the majority of the disciplinary and psychiatric cases which occur among its students, the saddest kind of evidence of what a home in some sense broken does to the children who grow up in it.

Surely the General College can do no less than enter resolutely into the field of education for home life.

## THE FIELD OF EARNING

Biologically basic, also, is the field of earning. Obviously, no man is well adjusted who cannot earn a decent living for himself and for those dependent upon him. Society should give him the opportunity to earn; and he should be able to accept the opportunity.

The students with whom we are now concerned comprise the many who when they come to college know that they want to enter some non-professional occupation, and the still greater number who have not decided what they want to do. Practically all of the men in this double group, and many of the women, must be bread-winners.

Yet these students want further general education rather than occupational education. It is therefore not the part of the General College to undertake training for a variety of particular occupations: it could hardly do so even if it so desired.

But the General College must recognize fairly and squarely the fact that most of its students are soon to be engaged in some gainful occupation, and must do all that it can appropriately do to prepare them for that phase of their lives, obviating so far as possible the types of occupational maladjustment that now occur so frequently: waste of time through delay in finding the occupation of final choice, serious difficulties of personal adjustment in the early stages of employment, and unnecessarily prolonged occupational inefficiency and unhappiness.

There appear to be three ways in which the General College should move to meet this range of needs: it should inform its students as thoroughly as possible as to the character of the various occupations; it should make available to them individual advice with reference to the choice of an occupation; and it should prepare them for many of the types of personal adjustment which they would have to make as employees or as employers.

The General College should not be, however, a vocational school. It should be concerned with *all* the fields of social living—no more with the field of earning than with the fields of home life or citizenship or leisure or philosophy and religion. And with all its preparation for life in the field of earning, its greatest service to the prospective earner will unquestionably be to estab-

lish or strengthen in him, while it can, interests and abilities which will remain essentially non-occupational in character.

#### CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship should mean, in the first instance, the judicious exercise of the franchise in local, state, and national elections. Judicious exercise of the franchise involves far more than the casting of votes: it means a constant and difficult process of gathering information and forming judgments as to candidates and issues. It is not merely a matter of becoming intelligent during campaigns: it is a matter of the continuous lifelong building of political intelligence. The larger the issues involved, the greater the demands upon the electorate: and we are being called on more and more frequently to pass judgment on matters of international importance.

Every qualified citizen should be ready to bear his share of the burden of government. In the case of local government this may mean precinct or ward committee service, or special service of some other sort which can be rendered without withdrawal from one's main occupation. It is much to be desired that a far greater range of citizens, both men and women, should take their turn in such service than now do so. Beyond this lies the undertaking of full-time political service, temporary or permanent. The possibility of entrance into a political career, and of good performance therein, should invite the students of the General College.

But citizenship means still more than this. It includes many types of constructive participation in the life of the communities, small and large, of which the citizen is a member. It includes, for instance, participation in voluntary activities designed to safeguard and to increase the welfare of the various communities concerned. The development of myriads of such activities is indeed a major phenomenon of our time, and they cry aloud for just such intelligent guidance and mutual integration as college men and women should be able to give.

#### LEISURE

Beyond the immediate activities of home life, of gainful work, and of citizenship, there lies for most educated men and women

a considerable margin of leisure. Busy as we are, few days pass without some time left free for restful and recreative enjoyment. As conditions in the economic world tend toward the general shortening of the working day and the working week, the margin of leisure for mankind in general is being increased, and the problem of the use of leisure is becoming one of steadily greater importance.

Leisure begins at home, and the use of home leisure is an important phase of home life. But as leisure links home with home, or reaches out beyond the home, its use becomes a broadly social activity.

It is in leisure that the surplus energy of most of us finds release; it is in leisure that literature, the fine arts, music, drama, and the other creative activities which spring from the artist's surplus energy are most naturally enjoyed, and that amateur artistic creation finds its place. It is in leisure that one's avocations are to be pursued. In leisure is the realm of sport and sportsmanship. The conversation of leisure may produce not only its own immediate enjoyment, but the planting of seeds which may come to fruit and flower in many of the other phases of life.

For the graduate of the General College leisure would include on the average, perhaps, something like three or four hours of the waking day. That is a large part of life—so large, and so important, that the General College should educate for it with a resolute and imaginative intelligence.

#### PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

The field of philosophy and religion is a field of social living no less truly, but in a somewhat more restricted sense, than those considered hitherto. I mean by philosophy the endeavor to understand life as a whole; and I mean by religion the willing and cooperative consciousness of the interrelations of all life and of the creative spirit which moves through all life, together with the activities which follow from such consciousness. Some measure of such understanding and such consciousness is necessary, like physical and mental health, for satisfactory living in any field. Not that we can, in the time of this our infancy, reach a closed certainty as to that which is infinite; but the framing of

some pliant and modifiable philosophy of life, some reasoned working hypothesis, gives a stability which we greatly need. The development of such a hypothesis is social in its process, in so far as it comes through listening and through discussion; and it is social in its results, in that its attainment brings increased energy and a stronger sense of purpose.

The field of religion is more directly and more obviously a social field in its aspects of service and of shared worship. In its aspects of service it touches and continues the field of citizenship. By shared worship I mean the willing and cooperative consciousness, on the part of two or three or more who are gathered together, of the interrelations of all life and of the creative spirit which moves through all life. That consciousness is perhaps our richest source of the direct attainment of fullness of life, perhaps our greatest stimulation to such living as will benefit society. It is beset with dangers of undue emotionalism and of undue formalism. It may at best transcend intelligence; but it must not run counter to intelligence. It is a source of social power; and it is therefore a matter of educational concern.

### III

For the ability to live well in the several fields of social living, five things are necessary: (1) health; (2) the possession of the general mental tools necessary for the acquisition and the application of knowledge; (3) knowledge specific to the field in question; (4) experience, actual or vicarious, within that field; and (5) a truly social attitude. The General College, then, should provide education in health, in the use of general mental tools, and in the development of a truly social attitude; and should provide instruction and experience specific to each of the five fields of social living.

In each case the college should utilize all the resources at its command. That is to say, it should utilize, as means of education, not only the curriculum, but also residence halls and extra-curricular interests. The existing college has not fairly assumed the responsibilities or developed the opportunities involved in the residential aspect of college life. The failure of the college to provide adequate residences of its own has led to the development of the fraternity and the sorority; and neither in college-owned

halls nor in fraternities and sororities has residence been properly utilized from an educational point of view.

Extra-curricular activities, athletic and non-athletic, constitute a very large part of the life of the modern college. But they not only constitute part of the immediate life of the students: they constitute part of their educational experience as well, for they give training for participation in a large variety of later social activities. At the present time college faculties, with all too much justification, regard extra-curricular activities as being, in general, liabilities rather than assets. Potentially, at least, they are assets—and they should, in the General College, be so handled as to be made assets in fact.

Education for the five fields of social living should be carried on in the General College for those who go to that college, but it is not to be assumed that such education should begin in that college. It should begin in the lower schools; and the General College, both in its general plan and in its treatment of individual students, should effect an organic continuity with the work of those schools. Yet the work of the General College should be new in its specific appropriateness for young men and women who, with the relative maturity of schooled adolescence, are about to enter, as participants, into the active life of human society.

#### IV

In this address I am necessarily concerned with matters of general theory rather than with matters of detail; but I venture to suggest in passing the following recommendations with reference to the General College: care of mental health as well as of physical health; training in spoken as well as in written English; acceptance by all departments of responsibility for training in the use of English; study of the modern foreign languages primarily for the development of reading knowledge; acceptance by all departments of responsibility for training in reflective thought; maintenance of a special course in reflective thought; extensive training of freshmen in methods of study; maintenance of a regular course in bibliography; the establishment of work, not all in one department, covering such matters as the history of the family, the psychology of family relations, sex hygiene, child psychology, housing, and individual and family finance;



maintenance of a regular course in occupational information, together with provision of occupational counseling; absence of students for a limited period during the college course to engage in actual employment; combination of the departments of social science; development of understanding of the international field, including Russia, China, and Japan; study of the well-nigh infinite variety of voluntary organizations by which the life of the American community is so largely carried on; dissociation of the teaching of literature from the teaching of language; maintenance of courses in foreign literature in translation; admission of work in fine arts and music to full collegiate status, together with the acceptance of practical work in those fields for college credit; emphasis upon intra-mural rather than intercollegiate athletics; maintenance of an integrating philosophical survey course in the last year of the college; maintenance of special work in the field of modern religious problems; maintenance of a considerable staff of advisors, in theory co-extensive with the entire faculty, to each of whom a certain number of students should be assigned; correction of the causes of excessive departmentalism; in the case of a new college, refusal to admit fraternities and sororities; special training for exceptionally able students; adoption of the quarter system; and treatment of the first quarter as a "Freshman Quarter," devoted to the difficult process of the adjustment of the freshman to the college environment.

Through lines of thought into which I cannot well enter here, I have been led to the conclusion that the length of time required for the satisfactory completion of a General College course would be not four years, nor two years, but three: I therefore propose three years as the normal length of the General College course.

The degree to be given at the end of such a course should be a new degree peculiar to the new type of institution, it should be dignified in itself, and it should bear some relation to the traditional college degree. Such, for instance, would be the degree of Laureate in Arts, which might be abbreviated as L.A.

## V

An individual General College might come into being either as an entirely new institution, or as a modification of an existing institution.

The foundation of such a college might well appeal, as a pioneering project, to some man or woman or group of men and women concerned for the right development of higher education in this country and able to provide the necessary financial support. A city which has not yet developed a municipal Junior College might well consider the establishment of a General College as the culmination of its public educational system.

Of the existing types of institutions of higher education there are two which could transform themselves, with a minimum of difficulty and a maximum of appropriateness, into General Colleges. The two types in question are the separate Junior College and the insufficiently endowed four-year college.

The Junior College has grown very rapidly of late, both in numbers and in the extent of the territory in which it appears. In 1900 there were only about ten such colleges in the country. Today there are over four hundred. They constitute striking evidence of the fact that there is a wide and growing demand for a course of higher education shorter than that of the four-year college.

But the present Junior College is unsatisfactory in two respects: its program has not been really thought out as an independent educational program; and the length of its course, two years, is too short. Its program is really taken, with little change, from the program of the lower half of the existing four-year college. Two years is too short a time for the giving of a satisfying and distinctive collegiate experience. No sooner does a student really get into the spirit of the institution than he is on the verge of leaving it. The influence of the collegiate atmosphere as a whole hardly has time to produce significant educational effects. That a two-year Junior College can survive as an extension of a strong secondary school system is entirely probable; but the prospects for the survival of the independent two-year Junior College are very doubtful. Many Junior Colleges, discontented with their present status, are seeking to attain four-year status. The three-year General College, with its rich and distinctive program of education for social living, would seem to offer to the existing Junior College just what it needs to become a strong and thoroughly serviceable institution.



For the large number of four-year colleges which are insufficiently endowed, transformation into three-year General Colleges would be a saving measure. The work of the junior and senior years, in the modern four-year college, is highly specialized, and the costs of providing, housing, and maintaining the ever-expanding library and laboratory equipment necessary for proper specialized instruction have become, for many institutions, a staggering burden. For the insufficiently endowed college, the uncompromising attempt to continue as a four-year institution is doomed to failure. The way of escape lies in the adoption of a status not only new in its more appealing motivation, but also far less expensive. If the insufficiently endowed four-year college is to continue at all, it must continue as some type of shorter college. Its choice is really the choice between adopting a three-year status or sinking to a two-year status—and the former alternative is in every way the more satisfactory.

## VI

So much for the General College, which is to serve those students whose interests are non-professional. Let us turn now to the other group of students, for whom the existing college is fairly well adapted, namely, those students who intend to enter the learned professions, together with a considerable number of others who share the intellectual interests of their pre-professional companions.

This double group is likely to contain a relatively high proportion of those men and women who are destined to become leaders for society. It is therefore of the utmost importance from the point of view of society that the education of this double group be such as to enable its members to play as well as possible their strategic parts in the social order.

Our problem is then this: How may the existing college most perfectly adapt itself to the task of providing higher education for its own proper group of students?

For the sake of brevity I next assume, with only the slightest comment, what is really a major premise in my argument: namely, that the existing college is already splitting into a lower half, devoted to general education, and an upper half, devoted to specialized education. Some trace of this bisection is probably

to be found in practically every institution represented here. In some it has gone so far as the giving of separate names to the lower and the upper halves of the institution. Related phenomena are the new plan of the University of Chicago, in which the upper half of the college is not only detached from the lower half but is combined into a unit with the graduate schools; the plan announced, but not yet carried out, by Johns Hopkins, namely, the complete dropping of the first two years of the college course; the rise and extraordinary multiplication of separate two-year Junior Colleges; and the tendency for students to leave college entirely at the end of the sophomore year or to transfer at that time to a stronger college or to a university.

The bisection of the college is then to be accepted as a generally accomplished fact. It would seem to be the part of wisdom for the college to accept and capitalize the bisection, organizing the lower half definitely for the giving of general education and the upper half definitely for the giving of specialized education—and giving to each half a clearer definition, a fuller development, a more socially purposeful and effective program of study and experience, and an outer organization corresponding to the inner unity.

## VII

Assuming, then, that the lower half of the college is to concern itself with general as against specialized education—and bearing in mind the general assumption that the students of the college are headed for the professions (or have quasi-professional interests)—what, from the point of view of society, is the best curricular program and what is the best plan of organization for the lower half of the college?

My answer is: a curricular program and a plan of organization substantially identical with those of the General College. For what these students, like the others, need most of all is education for the several fields of social living. *The minister and the lawyer and the physician and the teacher are not merely members of certain professions: they are in the first instance, like other men and women, members of society.*

They are to enter a special field of earning, and are to receive special training therefor: but they, like other men and women, must enter the other fields of social living. They too face the

possibilities of winning and giving happiness in the family, of being cooperative citizens, of finding and giving rich and varied enjoyment in their leisure hours, and of thinking well and living well in relation to the whole of life—and they face the corresponding dangers of disastrous failure. The very fact that their professional activities are to be of special importance for society makes it highly to be desired that those activities should be rooted in lives which are well adjusted in the fundamental social relations. Only so will their professional service be completely clear in vision, completely fine in purpose, and completely sure in performance.

The existing college does not prepare well for the several fields of social living. It has not regarded that as its function: it is only natural, therefore, that it has not sought to give such preparation.

Yet the question as to whether the college ought not to relate its work more directly to the needs of society has been raised from time to time since the early part of the nineteenth century, and has been brought very much to the fore by the rapid increase of students in recent years. The college has gradually been forced into a position in which it had either to modify its program drastically or else to justify to itself, at least, its maintenance of the old program.

It has indeed improved its program very greatly in recent years—through the addition of many courses, through the establishment of honors work, and in other ways—but it has not chosen to modify its program drastically. Its traditionalism is no more marked than that of the other great institutions of society; but its traditionalism is perhaps less warranted in that the college presumably holds in higher measure than other institutions the intellectual vigor which should make for directed evolution.

Justification of the existing program among college men takes, usually, one of two forms. There are those who say: "We are doing rather well a certain type of work; we do not believe it is necessary or desirable for us to undertake any other type of work; if students do not want the work we offer, or cannot profit by it, that is their loss and not our concern." And there are those who, with more sense of the social need, yet believe, with

entire honesty, that collegiate knowledge in itself, if conscientiously presented by teachers and acquired with sufficient industry by students, possesses some magic, some talismanic power, which, though not related to the particular problems of life, will somehow stand college graduates in good stead for the meeting of any problem whatsoever.

Yet one has but to examine the existing college program to see that it does not attempt really to meet the major social needs; and modern American life is replete with evidence that the college program does not meet those needs. For more than a generation now the majority of the positions of great influence in American life have been filled by college graduates—and the result, as a whole, is not one in which the college can rightly take much pride.

The lower half of the existing college should then, in theory, be substantially identical with the General College. But theory is here at once confronted, in so far as the length of the course is concerned, with the ineluctable facts of economic pressure and human impatience. A three-year course may be altogether desirable for those who are not to prolong their education after its completion; but for those who are to have two more years of college with three or four years of professional or graduate work after that, the case is different. The work of the upper division of the college cannot be done in less than two years. To interpose a total of five years rather than four between high school and the professional schools is to create an economic barrier which would defeat most students. And the desire of young men to be at their own real work tends to grow so fast in the late teens and the early twenties that they are likely to do less than justice to intellectual experiences which seem to them to delay entrance upon their work.

The students of the pre-professional college will be on the whole of higher average scholastic ability than those of the General College: they should be able, therefore, to cover somewhat more ground in a given time, either by carrying more work or by making more rapid progress from point to point in a flexible program. It is then not unreasonable to think that they could get the main values of the General College program in two years.

With much regret, therefore—for I believe that the full benefit of the General College program, even for very able students, can hardly be had in less than three years—I am forced to the conclusion that the length of the lower division of the existing college should remain as it now is, two years. But I maintain that the purpose of this phase of the work of the college should be not just education in general, but education for the several fields of social living.

### VIII

With reference to the upper half of the college, which may, for the sake of brevity, be called the Senior College, I have little to suggest that is really new. In the Senior College the educational purpose becomes definitely pre-professional. This means that the students should develop skills of the type which they will need in their professional work, that they should acquire such knowledge as will be assumed at the beginning of that work, and that they should build a fairly broad special base for that work—that is, that they should gain a really good understanding of the whole field in some portion of which they are later to do professional work, and, if possible, of the immediately adjacent fields.

Entrance into the Senior College should not follow automatically upon the completion of the work of the lower division of the college. It should be a strictly selective process, involving the presentation of evidence of a high level of general ability, and confirmation of professional or quasi-professional intention. To students so selected a much higher degree of individual initiative might be left than can be left to students in the existing college. The entire work of the Senior College should be, indeed, of the character of honors work.

While the Senior College is no longer concerned with general preparation for the several fields of social living, it should, nevertheless, be conscious of a social purpose. The professions to which the students of the Senior College look forward are, in the last analysis, social ministries, and should be exercised as such. Furthermore, the group of students who go through the Senior College is likely to contain a fairly high proportion of men and women who have it in them really to do something effective toward the improvement of society.

The college has a commission, not to perpetuate the *status quo*, but to make its improvement possible. It is for this service that the intellectual independence of the college is most precious, and indeed most valuable to society. That the *status quo* is shot through with a staggering number of acute and menacing problems in the field of social relations needs no argument here. Nor can there be effective challenge of the statement that these problems are so menacing, in mass and intensity, as to threaten even the maintenance of what is good in the *status quo* itself—to threaten even the continuity of such small measure of civilization as we have thus far achieved.

There are two ways in which the Senior College may perform the social function thus indicated. In the first place, it should maintain a particularly strong combined department of the social sciences, primarily for the benefit of those who are going on into the law and for those who intend through other channels to undertake active participation in public life. Such a department should deal, presumably even more than other departments, in terms of problems rather than in terms of bodies of knowledge. There should be faced, for instance, the fundamental and manifold problem of economic distribution, and in particular the problem of unemployment; the problem of the organization of the international community, and in particular the problems of international finance and of the prevention of war; the problems of race and immigration; of disease, intemperance, and crime; of the making and the observance and the administration of law; of national governmental organization, with particular regard to its representative character and its financial support; and of the formation and direction of public opinion. The existence of many such Senior College departments of social science should, before long, make a definite impression for the better upon the social, economic, and political life of the country.

In the second place, the heads of other departments—if, as they should be, they are men and women who see their work in relation to the needs of society as a whole—should, by whatever methods or emphases may seem feasible to them, convey to their students something of their vision of those needs and of the contribution possible through the use of such knowledge and such skill as are specific to the department in question.



## IX

To summarize. Up from the high schools today there are coming two groups of students: a non-professional group and a pre-professional group. For the former group there should be provided a new type of college, with a three-year course, devoted primarily to education for the five fields of social living. For the latter group the existing four-year college will continue to serve: but it should in the first place, recognize and capitalize the division into upper and lower halves; in the second place, devote its lower half primarily to education for the five fields of social living; and in the third place, conceive the task of its upper half as being essentially an endeavor to further the maintenance and the development of human society—a society shot through with problems which menace its very existence, a society rich in the possibilities of an as yet undreamed-of fullness of life.

---

ECHOES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

I enjoyed very much the Cincinnati meeting, and benefitted a great deal from the program of the Association of American Colleges. I find these contacts very stimulating and helpful.—*A College President.*

It was a great pleasure to be at Cincinnati. I believe I got more out of that meeting than I have out of any educational association that I ever attended.—*A College President.*

I liked your program at Cincinnati. Mr. X is a delightful speaker.—*A College President.*

I regretted my inability to go to Cincinnati. Your meetings are, as a rule, the most interesting and stimulating educational meetings that I attend; and I am always sorry to miss one of them.—*A University President.*

## MESSAGE TO THE CINCINNATI MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

LAWRENCE PEARSALL JACKS

PRINCIPAL OF MANCHESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD UNIVERSITY

I MUCH regret my inability to attend your great conference at Cincinnati. If I had been able to do so I would have taken the opportunity to speak of those fundamental things which are common to educators all over the world; the ultimate things which give to our work its dignity and value. In this message I will tell you briefly what they are as I conceive them.

I believe that our civilization has now to choose between two things—education and catastrophe. Unless we can succeed in raising the quality of human beings to a higher level, both mentally, physically, and morally, it seems to me certain that sooner or later, and sooner rather than later, the fabric of our civilization will collapse. All our other problems, political, industrial and economic, are centered in this great problem of raising the quality of this human material which forms the living substance of our civilization. But this can be done; our work as teachers is to find out how it can be done and to do it. Every teacher and educator, from the beginner in a grade school to the President of a University, has a part to play in getting it done. We teachers should think of ourselves as a great army in active service, fighting the battle on the issue of which the fate of our civilization depends. We are doing our work injustice when we think of it as merely a *profession*. It is a *mission to humanity*, the great mission of the age. We bear the central responsibility of the civilized world; we are all soldiers in that cause and brothers in arms—no matter what nation we belong to.

I look upon education as the great adventure of the twentieth century. Unlike those who exploit the riches of the material world, we are engaged in exploring and developing the far greater riches that lie hidden in human nature. It has dawned upon the modern world that of all the precious things that exist and grow upon this earth by far the most valuable is man himself. We are beginning to explore his vast possibilities, just as our forefathers, centuries ago, began to explore this vast continent. We are beginning to see that man, in his haste to



develop the material world, has neglected to develop himself. And now we are turning to this new human continent and finding there a task which will surpass in splendor all the past achievements of our race—the task of educating man to the full stature of his possibilities. Nothing so hopeful, nothing so fascinating, nothing so adventurous has ever been attempted before. It calls for the service of the best men and women of every land. There was a time when the calling of a school teacher was despised. I believe the time is coming when it will be regarded as the most honorable and important calling in the world, a calling which gives larger room than any other for the competence of the wise man, the courage of the brave man, and the faithfulness of the true man.

It is of course upon the young that the work of education will mainly operate. The hope of the future lies with them. I do not think that the course of the world can ever be greatly changed for the better by appeals addressed only to grown up people, whose habits are already formed. If we would have a new and a nobler civilization we must lay the foundation of it in the young and begin to do so from earliest childhood. Unless we catch them while they are young we shall never change the habits of the people for the better either in regard to their labor or in regard to their leisure. Their labor might be made far more excellent than it is, and their leisure might be made a hundred times as enjoyable. But we shall do neither thing unless we liberate and train the creative part of them while they are young. The happiness of the individual, and the values of civilization are impossible without a high degree of creative activity. The education which is to save our civilization from catastrophe must follow the creative line from the very first.

Two great principles have been discovered which may help us to achieve this object. Both were discovered long ago by the ancient Greek; but unfortunately they were forgotten by those who established our traditional system of education, and it is only of late that they have been revived and brought to bear on educational policy.

The first is the principle that the best approach to the *minds* of young people lies through the medium of their *bodies*. Young people should be taught to *think* with their whole bodies. Sane

thinking must always be expressed by the whole body. In practice this means that a genuine physical education, which of course is a very different thing from mere gymnastics, should be made accessible to every child in the community on exactly the same terms as reading, writing, and arithmetic.

The second is the discovery that the play instincts of the young have a high educational value and can be made use of, under wise training, for wider and beneficial cultural purposes. These play instincts, which sometimes take the direction of active games, and sometimes the direction of arts, crafts and hobbies, are the first form which creativeness takes in the life of the young. By giving them opportunity and skillful guidance this creative spirit can be established as a permanent possession for later life and led on to great heights of excellence and beauty.

I would recommend both principles to the earnest attention of your conference. It is the merit of the so-called "Recreation Movement" (so well represented in this country by the National Recreation Association) to have brought both these principles into prominence on the educational field. I regard it as a contribution of the utmost importance to the New Education which the modern world requires.

In conclusion, I would express my fervent hope that your conference will inspire every member of it with new ardor for the great adventure of the twentieth century—the work of education.

---

The Association office has in stock many reprints from the BULLETIN of interest to members, new and old, at a nominal price. Send in your order today.

*Bulletin Reprints*

	<i>Each</i>	<i>Ten</i>
"Educating the Educators," Deans of the Graduate Schools of American Universities.....	\$ .35	\$ 1.50
"The Financial Needs of a College, and How to Meet Them," D. J. Cowling and Trevor Arnett .....	.35	2.00
"The Occidental Colleges, A Survey," Robert L. Kelly.....	.35	2.00
"Bibliography on the Professional Growth of Faculty Members," Lester W. Bartlett.....	.15	.75
"A College President's Professional Library," Archie M. Palmer .....	.10	.50
"The Revolt Against Questionable Questionnaires," Robert L. Kelly .....	.10	.60

## EDUCATION AND DEPRESSION

CHARLES P. TAFT, 2ND

THEY had a depression in Ireland a few years ago and the Blacks and Tans were there, and two Irishmen discussing the situation, I think, covered our existing situation thoroughly. They said, "Sure, and it is so bad we had better send down to hell for Oliver Cromwell," and the other one said, "He wouldn't come."

With that I will leave depression behind and talk only about education, which after all has little care for depression. It goes on and it is equally important whether times are good or bad, perhaps more so now than at others.

I feel that I shouldn't begin, however, without a word of greeting to the new presidents. I would commend to your attention a story which my father used to tell about an old gentleman who ran a very distinguished academy in a New England town. He had a boy from a farmer's home some few miles out in the country, and the boy was rather difficult to deal with. He sent him home. He came again the next day and proved to be still more intractable. He sent him home, and this time he told him that he would have to stay. Well, he was there the next morning. He sent him home again and shortly after lunch the boy appeared with his father.

The father said, "Why, he is in this school," and the principal said, "He is not!"

"Why," the farmer said, "you sound as if you were going to do just what you damn please with this school."

The old man said, "Your language is coarse and your manner is offensive, but you have grasped the idea."

I suppose after that it is not fair to tell you the old one about Booker T. Washington. It was said, you know, that he started Tuskegee with forty students and one blind mule, and now the students have increased to one thousand and the faculty to forty.

I have been a member of several committees on speakers during the last few months, and from that experience I recognize the difficulties that your Executive Committee has had in the attempt to find someone who speaks your language, as Webster says in his daily cartoon; someone who could titillate your sense of

humor with witticisms of brevity and reasonable immaturity, and who perhaps (oh, ineffable grace!) could gently exercise your cerebral processes by the use of his own. Unfortunately, by reason of the disarmament conferences and other things, you have been cheated and you have to listen to a mere lawyer.

In the presence of so many practiced chapel speakers I feel bound to begin with a text. In the exercise of my passion for cheap editions I purchased the other day a copy of Young's *History of the Medici Family*, and very fascinating I found it. I have had a rather limited sympathy with the Renaissance in Italy, (I apologize, Mr. President), especially after the way it ruthlessly destroyed the well-beloved Gothic in so many places and filled up all outdoors, especially fountains, with the products of a gentleman named Bernini. The fascination, therefore, in this particular book was largely made up of a pleased surprise.

My text is the story from that book which pleased me most, that of the famous competition for the bronze doors of the baptistery in Florence, won by Ghiberti. The competition came about because of the decision to give the doors as a votive offering from the whole population to turn away Heaven's wrath as expressed in a virulent attack of the plague, a regular visitor in those days. I suppose that mass meetings were held and magazine articles were written to tell the government exactly what should be done, and this was the result. It was in the year 1400, often called the birthday of the Renaissance.

Three young men, two Florentine and a Siennese, were held to be the best, and amid intense excitement the prize was given to Ghiberti. One of his unsuccessful rivals went off in a huff to Rome, swearing that he would eclipse Ghiberti in some other art, and he succeeded. He was the greatest architect of his day.

Now there began a most unique educational institution. For fifty years Ghiberti worked on those two doors, twenty-two on the first and twenty-eight on the second, before they were finally put in place with appropriate ceremony. Ghiberti had to employ a number of assistants, and the pictures in bronze with their lifelike figures and excellent reliefs became a perfect school of art for all those having either the sculptor's or the painter's instincts. The labor expended was enormous. Again and again the panels were recast, Ghiberti always striving for something more perfect, and never satisfied until he attained the ideal for

which he aimed. He could destroy without a moment's hesitation no matter how much labor was involved in the imperfect result. There in those early days of art when the most elementary principles were unknown, he produced what are really pictures in bronze, panels containing as many as a hundred figures, with perspective, and even clouds marvelously rendered.

Among those assistants were the first modern painter, Masaccio, and the first great modern sculptor, Donatello, to say nothing of that wonder-worker in glazed terra-cotta, Luca della Robbia. They, with their master and the defeated competitor but great architect, Brunelleschi, are the founders of the Renaissance in art.

Young tells the story much better than I can, and I want to read you what happened fifty years afterwards:

In 1452, six years after Brunelleschi had died and Fra Angelico's painting in Florence come to an end, Ghiberti at last finished his second pair of bronze doors for the baptistery. These, which Michelangelo a hundred years later declared "fit to be the gates of Paradise," are considered Ghiberti's masterpiece. They represent scenes from Old Testament history, and Ruskin remarks: "The book of Genesis, in all the fulness of its incidents, in all the depth of its meaning, is bound within the leaf-borders of the gates of Ghiberti." They had taken Ghiberti twenty-eight years. He had begun his first pair of doors at the age of twenty-three; he finished his second at the age of seventy-three, and he died three years afterwards. Excepting his three statues outside of San Michele and one or two minor works, these two pairs of bronze doors were his life's work. As Alexandre Dumas says: "A whole life spent over this marvelous bronze!"

The pathos of the young Ghiberti beginning this beautiful work of art when full of youth and strength, amidst all the enthusiasm of the first outburst of the Renaissance, and finishing it when he was old and worn with years, and when so many who had seen its commencement had passed away, cannot but touch all who think of it. It was another generation who now saw its completion from that which had seen it begun. Cosimo himself, now sixty-three, had then been only a boy of thirteen. Fra Angelico fifteen, Michelozzo eleven, Luca della Robbia a child a year old. Masaccio, the boy who had worked under him, had covered himself with glory in another line, and was long ago dead. Brunelleschi, his passionate rival, had had time to learn another

art, and to make his name famous therein, and was gone. Of all the band of eager competitors for the work he alone remained.

As we look at these beautiful doors, how many thoughts crowd upon us. The terrible sufferings of Florence from the plague, which caused their construction; the celebrated competition with its intense and passionate rivalry; the whole lifetime of work spent in their production; all the art life which surged around them as they lay gradually taking shape in the work shop of Ghiberti, hard by the place where they have now stood for four hundred and fifty years; the school of art which that workshop became for Florence; the band of eager young assistants, some of whom had since made names which are now famous throughout the world. The final triumph when they were at last completed; the solemn function when they were erected in their place; the grey-haired man of seventy-three, bent with age, who had begun them in his youth, and who, had he had another lifetime before him, would have destroyed even these, and begun yet another effort after something more perfect still; the pride of all who had had a part however humble in their production; the excitement and rapture of a whole city. Lastly, the many things of which they were the origin and the matrix, the sculpture of Donatello, the painting of Masaccio, and all that grew from these; so that as we look at Ghiberti's panels, we see mirrored in them the triumphs of Raphael and of Michelangelo. It is thoughts such as these which force themselves upon our minds as we stand in the crowded modern thoroughfare, with its trams and tourists and life of the Florence of today around us, and look at Ghiberti's doors.

From that story I found a number of suggestions that bear on what I conceive to be important in education as I look back over the processes through which I have been conducted, myself.

The most striking quality of Ghiberti in that story is his thoroughness and persistence. What interests me this evening, however, is that this thoroughness arises from his own initiative. No one was standing over him saying, This is the task for today; here is your quota for the week; that much you must finish before you go to bed, or get out of school, or leave for home. He was thorough because he was passionately determined that his work should be complete. There was a proper ambition for public appreciation, or at least for the appreciation of those whose judgment and friendship he valued. But there was something else inside him, a restlessness that would not leave him, a spirit



that would not be quiet unless his maturing and ever more critical taste and judgment said of what he had completed, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

I look back on my own schooling, and I find that I was given certain lessons in advance of certain classes, and that a kind of habit and pride within me forced me to complete those lessons adequately. I stood well, for I did those lessons thoroughly, had some facility in taking notes, and was able to give back to the instructor in language he could recognize the pearls of his own wisdom. That kind of enforced thoroughness makes for character, and the schoolmaster rightly feels that to reach that result with much of the raw material with which he deals is success in education.

But now I am a lawyer. I am trying a case for a man seriously injured in an automobile accident. I must re-create for a jury of average intelligence, some quick, some slower, what happened, what I am convinced did happen. I must chase down twenty witnesses, and find out what each one knows, although nearly every one is working, is busy, is hostile, and doesn't want to come into court. I think, Oh, what's the use of going after this fellow; he can't know much; and it turns out that some little fact only he remembers swings the mind of the jury. Here is this doctor; his report in writing shows all he knows; what's the use when I'm so busy, of bothering to see him and go over his opinions in detail; and when I call him, the other side brings out on cross-examination some very damaging opinions. It isn't until afterwards that I find that this doctor is given to some optimistic guessing when he gets out of his own particular field, and that greater thoroughness would have saved that unnecessary damage to my client.

Now, my example is taken from the practice of law, but I submit that the principle goes further. I complain that no one taught me the necessity of driving oneself by one's own will power and initiative to complete a task. I think that is a part of the educational process. I congratulate you if you have taught your students not to do shoddy work, for there is far too much of that in the world. But I congratulate you far more if you have made available to the student the ideal of thoroughness.

Ghiberti had it in his soul and he could not help but transmit it to his assistants. I doubt if he said to any one of them, "Your lesson for our next conference is this arm, shoulder, and ear;

the following week please complete the rest of the head." The assistants whom he retained needed no such relief from responsibility, as they worked toward perfection, with the companion and master whom they loved.

The next thing I notice about the bronze door school of Ghiberti is that it is closely associated with adult life and experience. These young men who came to work for Ghiberti were students, but the product of their work was part of the life of the community, not something separate and apart. The master himself was learning; he was a leader more than an instructor. We approximate the method in modern times when a college professor or the head of the research department of a great industrial corporation works out its problems with the assistance of younger students.

I do not mean that everything taught to the boy and girl in school and college must have a direct relationship to his earning capacity. No one detests more than I do the utilitarian theory of education which insists on providing in school only courses that teach the young idea the trade or profession he expects to follow, and excludes what have been called cultural processes.

However, when I am given a course in the history of philosophy in such a way that it contributes not one iota to my theory or philosophy of living, then I object strenuously. I look back on that particular course with no pleasure, and I cannot see that it has helped me in the slightest degree to better living. I am not a philosopher and I claim no great acquaintance with Thales, Zeno, or Epictetus; yet I have found and I am convinced that there is something for me and for any man in the great broad principles of living that the great philosophers of the past have thought out.

I have just read an editorial in a Cincinnati paper which complains bitterly of just this lack in our educational system. The writer of the editorial thinks Latin unnecessary. In that I would disagree with him. There are some things about Latin—I remember the one they used to tell in New Haven about old Professor Kingsley. A boy was given a passage to translate. It began, "Ecce monumentum," and he started out by saying, "I have eaten the monument," and Professor Kingsley said, "Digest it! Next!"

But when he says that not one in one hundred who studies a modern language in high school or university ever learns to



speaking it, then I say Amen. He sums up my point perfectly when he says, "Why, in the name of suffering youth, cannot the methods of teaching be changed so that culture and utility are combined in every subject taught in the public schools?"

Now, I recall from my own secondary school days that we read *Cyrano de Bergerac* in French. That experience stays with me to this day. It led me to buy Brian Hooker's translation as soon as it was published and to see Walter Hampden three times in the play.

I can't help remembering (I suppose one shouldn't because certainly there is no moral principle involved) the place where Cyrano, after the duel and after most of the people had gone, had thrown his purse to the crowd, and his friends said: "Quelle sottise!" (What a crazy fellow you are!). And Cyrano said, "Mais quelle geste!". You can't forget that kind of thing.

When French is taught in that way, how can you forget? Your education is part of your life.

I took a course in daily themes in college. It was distinctly cultural, and yet there has been no single educational influence which has been more constantly with me in adult life. After all, what we want is to teach boys and girls how to live effectively. Should not every item of our curriculum aim toward that goal?

Like every good preacher, I now modestly depart from my text. In order to arrive at this ideal which I have just been discussing, it seems to me that every student should be taught as part of his course to keep every activity of his daily life in proportion. There has been some discussion in recent years of the ideal of a balanced personality. Every college provides for the proper physical development of its students. How many make the definite effort to teach them how to maintain their physical health when they leave college? It is perhaps taken for granted, but for that very reason most college graduates, or at least many, neglect their physical condition continuously from the date of their graduation.

How many have been given self-confidence in expressing themselves through the written or spoken word? How many can read aloud without making fools of themselves? I take all that to be not merely desirable but necessary to a full, happy and effective life.

I think the most striking example of it has been here in Cincinnati in connection with our Community Chest. The effort has been made in this city to select a different outstanding citizen each year since the War Chest in 1919 when the Chest here came to its full size for the first time. Each year, without exception, men have been selected who began the year—I say, without exception, but there have been two or three: one of the general chairmen was Frank Nelson, who was the outstanding minister of the gospel in this city. In nearly every case, however, they started out as rotten speakers, and all they needed was practice because by the end of their year—they preside, you see, at a number of meetings of the board in the course of the year and at several other meetings, besides those during the campaign—every one of them was an acceptable speaker.

How many are taught ideals of family and social living? Surely there is a reservoir of human experience in these fields which should be made available to boys and girls and young men and young women. Why should they be thrown into marriage with no guidance whatsoever, and why should they be permitted to go through an educational process without ever being told how to spread their personality through a broad, complete field although they might wish to specialize in some particular part of it?

In college and school they are taught literature, languages, fine arts, history and economics. Are they taught how to make those subjects guides and friends in joyous living? Courses under those heads give an introduction, an acquaintance, a familiarity and probably a sympathy with the fields of knowledge involved. But are they related to adult life itself after graduation? I submit that they are not except in the rare case.

To return to philosophy, what help is given to the student in finding a plan of life, a theory of living? He perhaps thinks it unnecessary to have such a plan or a theory. He may leave school or college before graduation because of the pressure of immediate things, financial, or amorous, and scarcely recognize that he is sacrificing any permanent good. But when he has left the college for five or six years and the freshness of his new occupation has worn off, it will be strange if he does not begin to wonder what use his job is anyway, and what life is all about. I suggest that if a few fundamental principles are pounded into him during his educational experience, they will return to help

him when he reaches that stage, and I suggest further that this is not so much a matter of facts, as a matter of method. The law schools do not and cannot teach their students what all the law is. No good lawyer can give an opinion on an important question of law offhand, at least he doesn't usually. What the law schools teach is a few main theories and a great deal of method.

For instance, this group will certainly not question the necessity of a spiritual background for happy and effective living. What effort do the colleges make to assist their students in securing such a background? How can anyone do without a study of the greatest religion, the Jewish-Christian religion as it appears in the Bible? I am not talking about a prayer-meeting, but a serious study of that tremendous story of the evolution of religious ideals that you find from the beginning to the end of the Bible.

I was very much interested in the last few months in reading that excellent book, *The Legacy of Greece*, and especially the introduction by Gilbert Murray. I had not realized until he pointed it out that nowhere else can you find such persistence of the good as in the history of Greek thought and action down through the centuries. He recalls that we still study geometry from Euclid, who wrote his book in sand two thousand years ago, and that as late as 1830 there was in use in English schools a text-book on grammar and rhetoric written by Denis of Greece in the first century. There was something in the Greek nature and character which somehow endured, just as there was in the spiritual searchings of the Hebrew prophets. There was a simplicity that grows more and more refreshing as our complexities increase in modern civilization. There was a liveness that is found again in the bronze door school of Ghiberti, that every one of us, I venture to say, would give much to possess. All of this helps to teach us how to live. Are the colleges giving it, or any part of it, to their students?

And now, again like a preacher, I return to my text. Ghiberti had an ideal, a heart's desire for perfection. The worst thing in our life today is that which the French have expressed so completely in a word which we have taken over from them, defeatism. We are told this is a world economic depression, with so many complex influences that no one can solve the problem.

We are told that there will always be unemployables who can't work and never could work. The implication is that they are forever worthless and might just as well be destroyed. We are told that clean politics are impossible. That you can't have honest and effective government. Men say that there will always be war. In this battle, thank God, the colleges are always in the forefront on the side which says, "This can be done!"

The social conditions which our great cities face in these times are beyond my powers of description. The wisdom of our social workers in their efforts toward rehabilitation has minimized the public knowledge of some of these conditions. But you and the social workers stand together in saying, "We can make these things better," and your graduates are leading in the fight.

In politics the skies are beginning to clear. Do not weep over the financial condition of our great cities. It is the opportunity for the forces of good government and they are not letting the opportunity pass. Why, I even heard the other day that the Postmaster-General had sent word up to the county government in Toledo, Lucas County, where he is the boss, you know, that they had to put in the merit system, and that comes from a source which I believe.

I could tell you a good deal of the leadership in this respect which the city of Cincinnati has given to the country. Let me only say that the men most responsible are men who have taken their ideals in substantial part from their colleges and universities.

So far as peace and disarmament are concerned, it is significant that one of the outstanding members of the American delegation to Geneva is a member of your Association and is the president of an old and honored institution. It is the school and the college that are turning the minds of the present and the rising generation to the determination that we must have peace.

At the end of an address, one should have a quotation, so they say. I submit to you two lines from that great student and interpreter of human nature, George Eliot. It perhaps would also describe the ideals of Ghiberti:

Why should our pride make such a stir to be  
And be forgot? What good is like to this,  
To do worthy the writing, and to write,  
Worthy the reading, and the world's delight?

## COOPERATION BETWEEN ART MUSEUMS AND COLLEGES

WALTER H. SIPLE

DIRECTOR OF THE CINCINNATI ART MUSEUM

IN European colleges and universities one is astonished at the interested and intelligent way in which students discuss art, music, and politics, as well as athletics. To be sure, they frequently talk of their regular work with feeling and sometimes with enthusiasm. I have noticed this in Oxford and Cambridge particularly. In America this attitude is too rarely found. Today I am interested solely in some method by which students in our colleges and universities can be stimulated to find in art something that is important to them. Many solutions of the problem might be offered, but I narrow my discussion to the possibility of arousing this much-abused student through a more active cooperation between the museums and the colleges. There are two aspects of museum service—social and educational. These two aspects mean two different types of activities. Again I am limiting my field to the educational phase of museum work and in particular to its relation to the student body of universities and colleges.

Within the last two decades many museums or art associations, call them what you will, have been established and the use of the automobile and the bus has become so general that an ever-increasing number of colleges have access to museums. Let us take for example Cincinnati. Of course, it is taken for granted that the universities located in this city derive benefit from the Museum collections, but as an instance of the service rendered to nearby colleges it is interesting to note that the Museum has been used by Miami University, Antioch College, Asbury College, Ohio University, Oberlin College, the Kentucky College for Women, University of Kentucky, and Marietta. The form that these contacts take naturally depends on the initiative and needs of the professors in charge.

Providing the teachers have the will to work with the museum, their first question is: What has the museum to offer? and their second: Is it anxious to cooperate? Here we are taking it for

granted that the policy of progressive museums includes a real willingness to help. What has the museum to offer? First and foremost, it has a collection of original art objects with which students can work. This is a distinct advantage over the reproductive material—photographs and casts—that most colleges are obliged to use. Original material makes it possible for the student to reconstruct a more adequate view of past civilizations. Actual objects stimulate the imagination more than anything, with the exception of visiting the countries and sites from which they came. These original works of art are divided into three groups—those that are on permanent exhibition, those that are in changing exhibitions, and those that remain in study collections. The study collections in many museums today have special exhibition rooms open only to research scholars and interested classes from different types of schools. The advantage of the study collection is obvious. Here the visitor has an opportunity to handle various types of objects and to inspect them at close range. Some museums in the United States have had the courage to set up exhibitions of forgeries. The Metropolitan in New York has an interesting classical room devoted to comparative study where forgeries are shown side by side with authentic pieces of the period. This is a type of study room, however, that demands courage on the part of the museum, for it may reveal the fact that forgeries have crept into the collection.

A second factor lies in the duty of the museum to maintain standards of quality, not only in the material exhibited but in methods of presentation. In permanent and changing exhibitions the museum should show only the best unless an attempt is made to put up an educational exhibition where varying degrees of quality are shown and pointed out. An emphasis on quality helps to set a standard which students may use as a basis for future judgments. This emphasis on quality should be given not only to the work of the older periods but also to those of contemporary times. In setting standards of quality the museum raises the general level of taste. Study in the galleries is bound to have an effect upon the visitor. The art taste of the average college student in America today is enervated and conservative. Often this is due to the fact that he has not come into contact with original material and because he has not been



trained in the principles underlying art expression. To a certain extent he has learned what he should like, but he does not understand why he should like it. He knows that Titian is O. K. because the text-books say so and because he is generally accepted. This type of pedantic knowledge, however, does not assist the student in forming judgments when faced with things with which he has had no previous acquaintance. Some method should be found by which the student can be brought to a realization of the inherent vitality in a great work of art. Students occasionally do want to learn, however. I recall a group of them who applied to a well-known museum for talks on modern painting because their professor of art, when he brought them to the museum, passed through the modern galleries without stopping and in his lecture told them there was nothing good to be found in the painting of today. Has a teacher the right to prejudice students against their own times?

The museum library with its books and art documentation offers an important service to not only students but teachers. As a rule, the museum library is built up about the collections in the museum and its city. Here can be found not only books but large collections of photographs and slides. The same standard of quality should be maintained here that is maintained in the exhibition galleries. The librarian is careful to see that only authoritative works by reliable authors are offered to the student and this is frequently a difficult task in the art field where so many sentimental, inaccurate effusions have been published. The collections of slides and photographs are formed to help in the elucidation of the works of art in the city. An outstanding example of documentation service connected with a museum is that carried on by the Frick Art Reference Library in New York. This is now used by students from all parts of the United States. It is housed with the Frick Museum which will soon be open to the public.

A word should be said concerning a museum's policy regarding transient exhibitions. Many museums today devote themselves mainly to the showing of paintings, sculpture, and prints. However, if the museum is to be of real service to the colleges, it is just as necessary for it to hold exhibitions of industrial art. Many students today are entering the industrial field and,

whereas the art museum is not the place for practical physics, chemistry, and engineering, the products of factories should be shown. By this I mean such phases of the industrial arts as glass, metal work, ceramics, textiles, lace, printing, and even the products of engineering—for are not buildings and bridges works of art? Advertising, too, is rapidly gaining recognition as an allied art. Today we are getting away from the idea that everything artistic is hand made. It is perfectly possible for the active museum to gather together groups of materials which express the best of contemporary design and technique in these fields.

Finally, I should like to call attention to educational programs. The well-organized educational department should bring all activities of the museum together in such a way as to make the museum a living organism. We are not concerned here with its work with public and private school children and the general run of adult visitors, although this department arranges classes for children and adults, guidance, and special talks. It should be possible for the museum to carry on a type of extension work in collaboration with the university. Such a scheme has been worked out successfully at the Metropolitan Museum and elsewhere. Not more than ten years ago the Metropolitan sent members of its staff to Boston to see what was being done there. The whole thing looked impossible to them. They were afraid that the universities in New York would not cooperate, that the students would not respond, and that the distances were too great. Today the successful development of this work at the Metropolitan stands as a splendid example for other cities. It is amazing what they have accomplished in ten years. Lectures and study courses are given at the Metropolitan by members of the museum staff. Several of these carry credit in the College of the City of New York, Columbia University, New York University, and Teachers College. A still larger number of courses are conducted at the Museum by professors from New York University. The aim of these is to bring about a better understanding of the subject-matter by means of actual contact with original material. This, of course, is in addition to the educational work carried on by the Museum for its members, their children, manufacturers, sales people, and buyers. In Germany

and Austria there is today very close cooperation between industrial art schools and museums. The success of industrial design in these two countries leads us to hope that cooperation between museums, schools of applied art, and departments of applied art in universities may be brought about with equally successful results in the United States.

I have attempted to outline an ideal museum from the university's point of view; as a matter of fact, it is what all of us in the museum field today are working toward. My next step is to sketch briefly and with due humility the ideal university from the point of view of the museum. What can the university do in our cooperative plan? I want to speak first of assistance that the academic departments can give. Museums sometimes lack sufficient funds to carry on careful study in all of their collections. Some of the research in our American museums has been hastily and scantily done, for it has not been able to keep up with the rapid growth of the collections. These institutions are in need of highly specialized workers who can produce or help in the production of sound, authoritative catalogues and other publications. Members of the academic departments of colleges can assist with the deciphering of inscriptions, iconography, and translations. Our curators, of course, can read Latin and Greek, French and German, but when it comes to the mediaeval languages, provincial forms, Chinese and Arabic, we must turn to the university. The Pennsylvania Museum today has university men as advisors in various departments. Frequently the college professors are willing to come to the museum to give lectures which are scholarly as well as popular. Here in Cincinnati we are particularly grateful to the men and women from the University who have appeared on our Sunday programs.

On the practical side there are any number of ways in which the university can help. Much of the detection of forgeries is done by means of X-ray and ultra-violet ray. The use of these necessitates laboratory experience. Preservation and cleaning of objects, methods of sterilization of prints, canvas, etc., to prevent decay, the treatment of diseased bronzes by electrolysis and of glass and enamels by other chemical means demand scientific knowledge. The Department of Scientific and Industrial Research at the British Museum maintains a laboratory where all

problems such as these are solved. Great Britain realizes the importance of preserving her vast publicly owned collections. Universities have been called upon to solve problems of lighting, acoustics, and vibration in the modern museum. I am told that the entire engineering department of the University of Chicago has devoted itself to the moving and safe installation of the ancient Assyrian bull for Dr. Breasted's museum of Oriental research. Beyond this, the universities, knowing the willingness of the museum to cooperate, can be of great assistance by discussing with museum officials ways in which the two institutions may be brought closer together. An ideal arrangement between the two institutions is one in which the university serves as a laboratory and library of information and the museum provides an opportunity for field-work not only in the department of art but in those of history, language, and literature.

The cooperation that I have outlined cannot hurt the student. It gives him an opportunity to build up hobbies and enthusiasms in the field of art. The changing exhibitions in a museum bring him into contact with the fine and industrial arts and he learns to understand representative examples of foreign and American work, whether ancient or modern. In this way he can keep in touch with what is going on in the world about him, has a basis for comparison with the work of the past, and can frequently find an explanation of what he sees in our shops, our homes, and our streets. He builds up a basis of criticism which should encourage him to become a man of discrimination. Preparation for real life is necessary. One must learn to earn one's living, but a part of real life lies in a sound comprehension of aesthetic values and in an appreciation of design in art which will help with the design of life. The museum performs a function in the community that is comparable to that of the church, the library, and the university, but to perform this function well it needs the cooperation of all of these.

## VITAL EDUCATIONAL MEASURES APPLICABLE TO COLLEGE

SAMUEL P. CAPEN

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO

I CHOOSE to begin at a point that may seem to you remote from my topic and irrelevant. I begin with schools of medicine and of law and with the universities of continental Europe.

The measurement of these institutions has not presented a very difficult problem. There are certain things that a practitioner of medicine or law must know and other things he must be able to do, if he is to serve the public acceptably. His knowledge and his skill can be determined by tests and are so determined in all civilized countries. The tests are seldom perfect. Often they tend to become antiquated. The effort of reformers is then required to bring them into line with new social demands and with the progress of knowledge.

If doctors and lawyers must know and must be able to do certain things, it is comparatively easy to say that the institutions which train them must possess certain facilities. Medical schools must have laboratories and dissecting rooms, for example, and must employ persons expert in bacteriology and chemistry. They must have sick people to study. It is comparatively easy to set minimum requirements for these facilities. It is somewhat less easy to determine the least that a law school must possess to enable it to give such training that its graduates can pass the tests set up for the protection of the public. An approximate determination can be made, however.

What about the universities of continental Europe? They are hardly to be distinguished on this score from our own schools of medicine and law. They are professional schools. Their degrees lead to the public services. This applies to the degrees in the arts and sciences as well as to the degrees in the more narrowly bounded professions. Knowledge and skill of a certain order are required for the public services. In particular, Europeans believe that the ability to make a contribution to existing knowledge is a fundamental requirement. The state sees to it that each university shall be sufficiently supplied with

teachers and materials to enable its students to prepare themselves for the tests that give access to the public services. Among other things each university must possess facilities to prepare students to make contributions to knowledge, at least in a limited number of fields. All European institutions are not equally supplied with men and materials. But again it is fairly easy to determine the minimum.

Do you wonder what this has to do with the topic assigned me? These examples I cite by way of contrast with the situation presented by the arts college in America, and to illustrate a principle that seems to me important.

This is the principle. Measurement implies gradations on a scale. There must be a top and a bottom to the scale, or at least a fixed point with reference to which things are measured, if absolute determinations are sought. Otherwise measurement must be relative; the things measured must be compared with one another in respect to certain fixed categories or attributes.

Those concerned with measuring American schools of law and medicine or European universities have a fixed point to guide their operations; namely, the test for entry into the public service. The point is not immutably fixed. It may wobble a bit from year to year. Indeed, it is not set with anything like mathematical precision. It may slowly shift to a higher level—and we know that it does. But it is sufficiently fixed for practical purposes.

Suppose we apply the principle to the college of liberal arts. Is there a measuring scale with a top and a bottom on which a college may be assigned its place? No. Is there a fixed point? Yes. What is it? It is a composite made up of dollars, units, semester hours, number of volumes, years of graduate training and the absence of disreputable entangling alliances. In other words, it is the standard set up by standardizing agencies and now more or less uniformly applied throughout the United States. How does the fixed point with reference to which colleges are measured compare with the fixed points used to determine the adequacy of the other institutions I have mentioned? The two are not comparable. Why are they not comparable? Because the fixed point that determines what a law school or a medical school or a European university must be is a test of



persons, a test of the fitness of persons for the public service. Only by derivation are institutional facilities involved. The fixed point that determines what a college should be is a measure of institutional facilities merely, and wholly disregards the fitness of persons for public or any other kind of service.

Let me now drop the European universities and consider only American institutions. I would not be understood to commend without reservation the measuring devices that have been and still are applied to schools of medicine and law and various other professions. These devices are full of errors. In some instances the application of them has represented a positive abuse. But the corrective of both error and abuse is always at hand. It lies in that ultimate fixed point with reference to which measurement is conducted. As soon as it can be proved that the fitness of persons for the public service can be better promoted by other institutional requirements than those in force, the standards governing institutional facilities are changed. The change does not take place with the speed of light, to be sure, but it takes place—and when it takes place its basis is thoroughly defensible.

All professional schools are therefore with respect to measurement in a totally different category from colleges of liberal arts. Can we bring colleges into the same category? Not now, perhaps never. Once the college and the professional school might have been measured from comparable and similar fixed points, although in those care-free days no one thought of measuring either. That was when colleges had a practically uniform curriculum based on the classical tradition; when, as Dean Woodbridge has said, this tradition "afforded . . . a common background of ideas and commonly understood standards of judgment." It would then have been possible to measure the products of colleges by a single, simple test, and inferentially to establish the institutional conditions necessary to produce the desired product. But fifty years of the elective system and its aftermath, fifty years of diversity, fifty years of the sciences natural and social, of the growth and segmentation of fields of knowledge, of democracy in education have destroyed that possibility.

From the point of view of those who would measure them today the difference between a college and a professional school

is a difference radical and irreconcilable. The difference is revealed by the kind of questions one can ask about each of them with the hope of getting a satisfactory answer. What is the first and most fundamental question that should be raised concerning any social institution—a church, the courts, an army, a school? The first question is: What is it for? Its success can be gauged only with reference to its purpose. I should like to stress this point. The confusion and much of the bitterness that have followed the attempts to measure institutions are due to the fact that the point is commonly ignored. Let me restate it. The success of a social institution—even that small modicum of success that justifies the institution's continued existence—can be estimated only in relation to its purpose. If the individuals associated with an institution derive from the association secondary benefits aside from the purpose, that may constitute a gain both for the individuals and for society, but it has no bearing on the success of the institution. If, for instance, a church member acquires through his membership skill as a song leader, it does not prove that the church is an effective instrument for cultivating the religious life. If a general in the course of his service becomes a master of the art of expository writing, the fact is irrelevant in judging the success of the army. Or if a college student by managing the glee club and the football team acquires some skill as a business executive and on the strength of it gets a position as bond salesman, that tells us nothing about the success of the college, unless preparing students to be bond salesmen is one of the aims of the college.

One can ask what an elementary school is for and get approximately the same answer from any informed person anywhere in the United States. To ask what a medical school is for is superfluous; the answer is so evident. What is a college for? Most of my hearers think they know. Most of them have covered a good many pages with their answers. So have I. Most of you will not accept my answer. I will not accept most of your answers. Each of our answers differs either a little or a great deal from every other answer. They may be grouped and classified, but no grouping and classifying will produce identity. And as the aims that we set forth vary, so do our colleges vary—although not always in strict conformity with the variations of

our statements, or to the same degree. Indeed, the differences that colleges exhibit would be still more pronounced—since each, no doubt, strives to achieve its stated aim—were it not that faculties, trained in similar ways and heirs of a long tradition, tend to follow similar modes of instruction.

Those who have been measuring colleges for the last two decades have not asked and do not ask what colleges are for. They know better. They ask another question: What is a college? That is Question Number Two in any rational sequence of inquiries dealing with social institutions. If Question Number One is omitted, it is very easy to answer Question Number Two. A college is what any agency strong enough to enforce its opinion says it is. The agency may be the state, or a regional or national accrediting association. With the best intentions in the world these associations and state departments of education have for a number of years been saying what a college is. At first divergent in their opinions, they have gradually reached substantial agreement. And now all at once they are beginning to be uncertain whether actually they do know what a college is, after all. Colleges insist on being something else than the accrediting bodies say they are or should be. They insist on disproving the significance of one after another of the items of the definition. Consequently existing standards are undergoing searching examination. Evidently revisions are in prospect.

I am not very hopeful about revisions, unless accrediting bodies will follow an entirely different course. It is idle to declare what a college is or should be without common agreement as to what purpose the college should serve. We must have such agreement, or stop trying to measure institutions as institutions. Can we get agreement? That is a purely rhetorical question. Of course we cannot get it—now.

We are in the midst of an evolutionary process. It has been slowly gathering momentum and is now proceeding apace. College education is being remade before our eyes. Experiments so radical that twenty years ago they could not have been imagined are going forward at more than a score of institutions. Some of the experiments will prove to be valid for all colleges. These will be imitated and the results of them will be generally appropriated. That is the way American education advances, by con-

tagion. Some will turn out to be unworkable and will disappear. A few will fit particular institutional situations but not the conditions of colleges in general. These will undoubtedly persist and will contribute to the growing diversity. And that is well. It is an advantage for the whole country to have institutions that differ as widely from the norm as do Antioch and Rollins and Swarthmore for example.

Let us be under no illusions as to the effect of current accrediting practices on this evolutionary movement. The effect is to retard it, in some quarters to check it. The reason is not that accrediting bodies tyrannically suppress well-planned experiments. Sometimes they encourage them; although generally experiments are ignored—if the experimenting institution is strong enough. The reason is that these bodies deal in stereotypes: years, credits, magic numbers of this and that. And these stereotypes have become the only respectable medium of exchange. Suppose an institution wishes to break with the credit system, for instance. It cannot do so entirely. Occasions will keep arising when it must translate its educational operations back into credits in order to maintain communication with its neighbors and with the authorities to which it must make reports. Or suppose it appoints to its faculty a man of erudition and magnetic personality who happens to possess no degree beyond the baccalaureate. A conviction of sin is bound to steal over all its officers. They conceal the foul deed if they can. These stereotypes are awesome things. They dry up the springs of analytical thinking and poison education at its source. It is on this account chiefly that I am opposed to present standardizing procedures and sceptical of any revision that is not absolutely radical.

But why must we keep on trying to measure colleges? Are we interested in colleges or in students? If we are interested in students, why don't we measure students and declare a moratorium on college measurement? It is not even necessary to be in perfect agreement about the purpose of the college in order to measure students. It is not necessary that all colleges should be attempting to do exactly the same things. It is not necessary that all should be able to carry students to the same stage of advancement. If it turned out, as the result of measuring

students, that some colleges did not offer them much opportunity or stimulus for intellectual growth, that would be important. It would be far more significant of the college's right to appeal for public patronage than any counting of heads or assets. If, on the other hand, certain institutions which had departed from the conventional scheme of college education were found to be leading their students to superior accomplishment, that too would be important. It might help us to determine what higher education in the arts and sciences should be in the fourth and fifth decades of the twentieth century.

Let me remind you again of the second part of the principle which I stated a few moments ago. There is such a thing as relative measurement. Things can be compared with one another in respect to certain characteristics. It might be very wholesome for our institutions to be compared with one another with respect to the accomplishment of their students at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of their college careers.

Something like this has already been done in the State of Pennsylvania with the help of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The graduating classes of nearly all the colleges in the state were given the same set of general examinations several years ago—with somewhat disconcerting results. Since then the study has been continued and extended. It will finally involve two generations of college students and will provide for periodic testing at various stages of their secondary school and college careers.

It goes without saying that I am not suggesting an excursion into a new and unexplored field nor one unfamiliar to members of this Association. A considerable variety of standard instruments for the measurement of students is already available. Most of us use some of them now. All of us could use more, if we chose to do so. Our national equipment of such instruments is as yet far from complete and some of the instruments themselves are not yet wholly satisfactory. But competent agencies are at work improving those we have and rapidly adding others to the collection. It may be worth while to take a brief inventory of the present stock.

We have an abundance of tests of mental ability. The succeeding editions of these tests show a constant gain in reliability.

The American Council on Education places a test of this kind at the disposal of all the colleges of the country each year. We are beginning to get promising aptitude tests. In certain of the subjects taught in both high schools and colleges we have tests of achievement which are now widely used for class placement at the time students enter college. Within the last two years the Cooperative Test Service under the directorship of Dr. Ben D. Wood has been established by the American Council on Education with the aid of a large grant from the General Education Board. This Service has already prepared a group of tests designed to measure achievement at various higher levels in the principal subjects of the college curriculum, and it is engaged in the preparation of others. Next May the Service is going to offer a general test for college sophomores to the largest possible number of colleges throughout the country. All institutions belonging to this Association have been invited to cooperate by giving the test to those students who are completing the junior college—and to the students of other classes should they so desire.

If, as teachers and administrators, we believe in the measurement of students impartially and by objective devices, here is an opportunity to put our faith to the proof. If we think it socially important to find out what the college population of America is accomplishing as the result of our ministrations, we can hardly decline to participate in this first nation-wide examination. I speak thus emphatically because I understand that the response to the invitation of the Committee which, under Dean Johnston's chairmanship, is in charge of this undertaking has thus far been disappointing.

Looking into the near future, it seems probable that the study of comprehensive examinations, now being conducted for this Association by Dr. Edward S. Jones, will furnish the basis for developing a different and equally promising instrument for measuring the achievements of students at the end of their college careers.

Are these "vital educational measures applicable to colleges," to quote the words of the subject assigned me on this program? If you wish so to construe the meaning of the subject, they are. At any rate, whether applicable to colleges or to students, they are educational measures. And educational measures, rather



than accounting or engineering or political measures, are what we chiefly need in this period of experiment and reform.

However, I regard the present chaotic stage of collegiate education as transitional and definitely transitory. It may be, and I think it is, more fruitful than certain periods in the past when objectives have been clearer and practice more stable. But finally we must achieve something like general agreement regarding the aim of the college. Toward that end, I dare believe, the present evolutionary disorder is tending. If we can never have as authoritative a guide as do the professional schools which must prepare persons for specialized public services, we ought at least to be able to define the purpose of the college in terms at once more significant and less contradictory than those now in use. We ought to be able to give back to the Bachelor's degree a meaning. I submit that the requirement of one hundred and twenty semester hours plus any arrangement of majors and minors you may choose is not a meaning. It is an escape from a dilemma.

No doubt there are educational statesmen enough in our profession to perform that task now—at least to their own satisfaction. But we are not ready for it yet. Our experiments must go further. Our self-questionings must become more candid and more penetrating. Our measurements of the details of the educational process must be extended and refined. When we are ready, I commend the task to the Association of American Colleges.

## THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

HERBERT E. HAWKES

DEAN OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE

THE Committee on Personnel of the American Council on Education took up its active work in 1926 and devoted itself during the next three years to the development of five projects, all of which had to do with the general problem of becoming acquainted with the individual student and of enabling him to develop his individual educational ambitions. When the three years for which the subvention allocated to this Committee came to an end, they were able to formulate a continuation of one of the principal projects which they had undertaken in such a manner as to justify a further subvention from the General Education Board for the purpose of the preparation, under the best auspices possible, of new-type examinations in a large variety of subject matters.

The general subject of examinations has been very much in the foreground in educational circles during recent years. Even those of us who would rejoice to find some device for the banishment to outer darkness of all points, credits, and grades, believe that the preparation for, and the taking of, an examination is an important educational experience. Each one of us must prepare himself to come up to the mark not infrequently and the habit of making adequate preparation for the best possible presentation of a complicated subject matter is one of the most important items of preparation for any important professional activity. But over and above the inherent educational value of the examination, so long as we pedagogues are obliged to recommend for degrees and other forms of academic accomplishment on the basis of grades, it is of the very greatest importance that the examination which forms so essential a part of the grading system shall be as perfect an instrument as we can possibly make it.

This Association is recognizing the soundness of the point of view which I have just expressed through its study of the comprehensive examination which will be reported on this afternoon by Dr. Jones. Scores of independent experiments with

various types of examinations are being carried forward in many institutions, all aimed at the discovery of a more searching and more accurate measurement of knowledge of a subject matter and of the capacity to use that knowledge both in thought and in action.

During the past ten or a dozen years the so-called new-type form of examinations has been developed in many fields of scholarship and in a considerable variety of forms. Those who have used this type of examination wisely are, so far as I know, convinced of its value. To say that an examination has been used wisely implies that it has been carefully prepared and is technically correct and that it has been scored according to the best practice. When one hears Professor X declare that he has no use for the new-type examination one must in fairness find out whether it was a good examination or whether it was full of ambiguities and inaccuracies such as are sure to appear in any except the most carefully criticized forms. In Columbia College where new-type examinations have been used for ten years in most of the departments of study it was necessary to decline to print papers unless they had received the approval of the technical expert. It must also be said that experience seems to indicate that one obtains a fairer measure of the attainment of a student by the combined use of the essay type of examination together with the new-type. One often hears the criticism of the new-type examination that it deals merely with factual material. No one who is familiar with the best forms of such examinations believes this to be true, but even if it were a just criticism, one is certainly justified in feeling that some method of finding out whether a student knows his facts is a valuable adjunct to our educational process. I admit that nowadays, as always in the past, there are certain temperaments who despise facts and regard them as beneath their serious consideration. They prefer to think of things and to talk of things in a large way rather than to be held down to any factual basis as a point of departure for their discussions. I am sure, however, that no argument in this audience is necessary to demonstrate the value of a factual examination.

One difficulty with the whole question lies in the fact that we do not accurately know just what aspects of the educational

process are tested by this or that kind of examination. Whether the knowledge of facts, the capacity to draw conclusions, or the ability to make predictions are tested by the new-type examinations more clearly and accurately than by the essay type of examination we cannot precisely say. One thing, however, is certain. Unless we have examinations of the various types that we employ which are carefully prepared and skillfully used we can never hope to find out the value or significance of any one of them. To this end the Cooperative Test Service, which has been subsidized for a period of ten years by the General Education Board, proposes to prepare for sale at a low price the new-type examinations in a sufficient number of comparable forms to take care of the demands for such examinations in secondary schools and the first year or two of the liberal arts college. This work is going forward under the directorship of Professor Ben D. Wood and the administrative control of a committee of the American Council on Education. It is anticipated that in the course of a year tests in certain of the subjects will be available.

Another important and interesting feature of the work of this Committee lies in the proposal to make use of a new-type comprehensive examination. The Pennsylvania Study which has been carried forward by the Carnegie Foundation under the directorship of Doctor W. S. Learned has made use of a new-type college achievement test which has been given to thousands of students in Pennsylvania at various levels of their college work. On the basis of this test it is possible not only to compare individuals in the same institutions, but for various institutions to compare the accomplishment of their entire student body with that of other institutions in the state. A subcommittee of the Cooperative Test Service has been organized under the chairmanship of Dean J. B. Johnston, of the University of Minnesota, comprising a distinguished but interested membership from various parts of the country. Under the auspices of this Committee, the test which has been generously loaned to the Cooperative Test Service by the Carnegie Foundation will be presented in as many colleges as care to give this test to the whole or a part of their student body. The advantages which will hopefully be realized by this enterprise are: (1) The comparison of accomplishment in a given institution year after year provided the

test is repeated. (2) The discovery in a given college of individual students of unusual accomplishment, the depth and breadth of whose knowledge had previously been unrecognized. (3) The opportunity to compare accomplishment in a given institution with the work done in other institutions of comparable type. (4) A comparison of the results from these examinations with the results gained in the regular grading systems of the college. To my way of thinking the discovery and isolation of the remarkable student through the medium of a test of this kind is one of its greatest practical values. The possibility of our harboring in our institutions a lot of mute inglorious Miltons whose talents never come to glad fruition because they are never recognized is little short of a tragedy. In the course of the Pennsylvania Study the number of extraordinary, able students who were discovered both to themselves and to their teachers was one of the conspicuous results of the enterprise. If this examination is given repeatedly and on a large scale it may well be that graduate schools might take the results of this examination as affording a basis for acceptance or rejection of candidates for higher degrees. Every one realizes that a competent student from a small college is a much better risk for a graduate school than the indifferent student from a powerful institution. If, however, the small college does not happen to be on the approved list of some association the student from this institution does not have a chance to enter upon graduate work effectively. I am convinced that the general use of an accurate and comparable set of forms of some examination of this kind would be a godsend not merely to individual students but also to graduate schools where some line on the capacity of their student body would be exceedingly welcome.

The Committee on Personnel has also under advisement a number of other projects which have not yet reached a point which justifies one in mentioning them in this connection. The problem of determining the vocational interest of an individual student is recognized as being exceedingly important. The vocational interest blank prepared by Professor E. K. Strong, of Stanford University, is recognized as furnishing perhaps the most satisfactory point of departure that we possess for a conversation with an individual concerning his life work. To carry

this study to a point of perfection so that we can really know more definitely how seriously its results should be taken is a matter which requires research and study over a period of years. It is exceedingly important that this project should be entered upon.

Another enterprise under consideration has to do with the determination of the existence of unitary traits of personality bearing somewhat the same relation to character or personality as chemical elements do to material things. Whether these elements of personality exist and the relations which they bear to each other are at present unknown but in the opinion of those best qualified to have a judgment on this point, we are now justified in asking for the expenditure of money in an attempt to settle this question.

A further enterprise which certainly ought to be entered upon has to do with the subject of examinations. It would be very much worth while to make a study of the functions of examinations as shown by the various past and present practices and by future needs. There should be a collection and accurate analytical description of the various examinations as related to their various functions as, for example, the oral examination, the written examination, the essay type, the comprehensive, and the new-type examination. There is enough to do in this field to occupy a large body of experts for some years and, if carried to a conclusion, would go far toward transforming our collegiate procedure from the haphazard, and rule of thumb method that we use at present to something approaching an intelligent treatment.

Furthermore, the whole question of education for leisure and what our colleges ought to do about it is bound to be an increasingly serious and important question in the years just ahead of us. With the increasing use of machinery for doing the work of the world, men and women are bound to have more time on their hands, and unless the problem of furnishing constructive and pleasurable means for use of leisure is developed, a large portion of our population is pretty certain to be making trouble for the rest of the world.

These are a few of the questions on which careful reports have been made and which are occupying the attention of the Committee on Personnel of the American Council on Education.



**THE EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE AND EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF  
THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN  
COLLEGES FOR 1931-1932**

**ROBERT L. KELLY**

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION :

**I** HAVE the honor to report briefly upon the Association's most active year. The number of projects in which the staff and officers have been engaged has been greater than in any previous year. It is believed these activities have not been of less value than heretofore. This report contains little more than a catalogue of these different phases of work.

**CONSULTATIVE AND ADVISORY SERVICE**

Undoubtedly the largest proportion of time of the members of the staff is given in the office and in the field to consultative and advisory service. During the last year approximately 15,000 sealed communications were received at the joint office of the Association-Council, and responses have been made, or are in process of making by the permanent secretaries and their highly qualified assistants. While much of this mail is of a more or less routine character there are also many inquiries, the answers to which demand extensive investigation.

**THE ASSOCIATION LIBRARY**

Much has been done during the year to add to the effectiveness of the headquarters library. Many accessions have been made both of books and periodical literature. An attempt is made to keep the cataloguing up to date. The office is equipped to answer the questions of member institutions or to furnish bibliographies for them on most phases of college administration and teaching.

**THE ADVISORY GROUP ON COLLEGE LIBRARIES**

Three members of the present Executive Committee, and in addition a former president and a former vice-president of the Association have served during the year on the Advisory Group

on College Libraries of the Carnegie Corporation. This Group, under the chairmanship of Dr. William W. Bishop, the Librarian of the University of Michigan, has recommended the appropriation of approximately a million dollars to college libraries for the purchase of books. In addition, the Carnegie Corporation has appropriated approximately \$800,000 to college library projects, which have been closely related to the specific work of the Group. The Group has been responsible for a number of important publications by the Carnegie Corporation, among which may be listed:—

*A List of Books for College Libraries*, by Charles B. Shaw, Librarian of Swarthmore College.

*The Emergence of the College Library*, by Louis R. Wilson, Librarian of the University of North Carolina.

*The College Library Today*, by William M. Randall of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago, the Chief Inspector of Libraries for the Group.

In addition, the Group is preparing a statement of principles for the administration of college libraries. There is ground for hope, therefore, that the Group has made some contribution toward developing what some thoughtful observers think has been the weakest link in the college chain into one of the major forces in the college.

We are happy to announce, also, that Charles Scribner's Sons have accepted the Gerould manuscript on College Library Buildings, which has been prepared under the auspices of the Association, having been made possible by a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation, and we expect that the book will be ready for distribution before many months.

#### COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS

As has been announced through the BULLETIN and through correspondence, the General Education Board has contributed \$25,000 for the Comprehensive Examination Study, and Dr. Edward S. Jones of the University of Buffalo has been made Director. He began work on September 1, with headquarters at the Association office. The Study is progressing very satisfactorily, with one hundred per cent cooperation from all institutions involved.

#### GENERAL COURSES IN MUSIC

Preliminary steps have been taken for setting up the music study authorized at the last meeting of the Association. The names of the Sponsoring Committee have already been published. President Ernest H. Wilkins has been made Chairman of this Committee. A hearty response has come from a multitude of colleges offering complete cooperation. The work is temporarily delayed pending an adequate appropriation.

#### COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN FINE ARTS

The manuscript for Mr. Gerould's book on College Library Buildings is referred to under the head of Libraries.

At the suggestion of the Commission on College Architecture and College Instruction in Fine Arts the office has collected the necessary data and Messrs. Larson and Palmer have prepared copy for a booklet on the recent progress of college architecture among member institutions. An interesting feature of this development, and of the Association's architectural service in general, is that many college architects as well as members of the Association are consulting our extensive source material. Data have also been assembled on the recent developments in the colleges in the field of the teaching of the fine arts. This material also has been ordered printed in booklet form by the Commission. Both manuscripts await the appropriation of the necessary funds for their publication.

Much emphasis has been given in the BULLETIN during the year and is given on our annual programs and in other ways to the development of the fine arts, including music.

#### COLLEGE CREDIT FOR CHINESE AND JAPANESE

Dean John R. Effinger makes at this meeting a report on the extent to which the Chinese and Japanese languages may properly be accepted in lieu of stated requirements for admission to college.

#### THE PRESENT STATUS OF COLLEGE FINANCES

At the request of numerous college executives in the Middle West, the office made an approach to member colleges for in-

formation as to the present status of their finances. This approach was made through the Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds. The results have been tabulated by Dr. A. W. Anthony, the Chairman of the Commission, with the assistance of Miss Ruth E. Anderson, and a report of progress is to be made at this meeting.

#### COLLEGE SURVEYS

As a project of the "Smaller College" Study an analysis has been made of the data gathered during the past two years in the name of the Commission on Educational Surveys, with a view of determining techniques used in college surveys, educational plans brought out as results of surveys, and the general applicability of such plans to the problems of college education. These compilations have been made under the supervision of Mr. Palmer in consultation with the Executive Secretary, and a summary is to be given at this meeting by President McVey, Chairman of the Commission on Educational Surveys.

#### LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE MOVEMENT

A committee of the Association consisting of President James L. McConaughy, Chairman, and President D. J. Cowling, Dean C. S. Boucher, President W. C. Dennis, and President Murray Bartlett, has been appointed to confer with a similar committee appointed by the Committee of Fifteen of the Liberal Arts College Movement, on the question of possible affiliation. This Committee is making a tentative report at this meeting.

#### ENLISTMENT AND TRAINING OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

A new approach has been made to the colleges under the auspices of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which students of high grade are entering the profession of college teaching. The results have been tabulated by Miss Martha T. Boardman and the report is presented by President McConaughy, the Chairman of the Commission.

#### THE "SMALLER COLLEGE" STUDY

This is under the direction of Mr. Palmer, the general outline of which was given a year ago. The number of institutions now

in the study is 118. Among this number are eight colleges affiliated with Friends, which have contributed financially so as to make possible a more intensive tilling under the direction of the Executive Secretary of certain areas than the general survey calls for. Arrangements have been made also for a similar intensive study of another group of colleges so that comparative data will be available. Especial mention should be made of the services within these intensive fields of the work of Miss Boardman, Miss Anderson and Mrs. McGleenan of the Association staff.

Furthermore it would have been quite impossible to make the study of these 118 colleges without a special appropriation of some magnitude, had it not been for the active cooperation of no less than fifteen graduate students registered in six universities—Columbia, New York, Oklahoma, Yale, Ohio State and Geneva. These students may properly be referred to as Graduate Fellows of the Association of American Colleges. From the data supplied by the colleges in this study quite a number of dissertations are being written. Some results of the studies have already been published in the *BULLETIN*, and much more will follow. The serious executive and administrative officers and students of administration and teaching will find in these studies much material for practical guidance, as well as of academic interest.

#### QUESTIONNAIRES

The office has carried on extensive correspondence both with member institutions and with others, especially the deans of graduate schools, with reference to the constructive distribution and use of questionnaires. The publications in the *BULLETIN* on this subject have attracted wide attention and elicited almost entirely favorable criticism. Reform movements have already been instituted in some of the institutions, chiefly along the following lines:

1. Those who prepare questionnaires should be acquainted with existing literature in the field to be covered.
2. Certain principles should be followed in preparing questions—(See page 377 of the November, 1931, *BULLETIN*).
3. The questions should be certified to by a responsible agency—usually a faculty group.

4. Before the questionnaire is sent out, an expression of willingness to cooperate, with the name of the correspondent, should be obtained from each institution to which the questionnaire is to be sent.
5. The author of the questionnaire should offer to pay the necessary expense of postage and clerical help in making the reply.
6. A copy of the completed study should be offered to the institutions cooperating.

#### FINANCES

The "Smaller College" Study, and the studies of some of the Permanent Commissions have made heavy drains upon the Association's financial reserves, but the business has been conducted entirely within the budget limitations. The Association should now build up again a reserve fund and this is provided for in the proposed budget for 1932.

#### APPLICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The applications of the following institutions have been approved by the Executive Committee, which recommends their admission to membership at this meeting:

Albertus Magnus College, New Haven, Conn.	Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va.
Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. D.	Maryville College, St. Louis, Mo.
Austin College, Sherman, Texas.	Moravian College for Women, Bethlehem, Penn.
Bishop College, Marshall, Texas.	North Carolina College for Negroes, Durham, N. C.
Clarkson College, Potsdam, N. Y.	Notre Dame College, South Euclid, O.
Colleges of the City of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.	St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa.
College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St. Joseph, O.	St. Vincent College, Latrobe, Penn.
College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Ark.	Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, Minn.	Union College, Barbourville, Ky.
Georgia State Woman's College, Valdosta, Ga.	Ursuline College, Cleveland, O.
	University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.
	University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn.	Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Penn.
Loyola College, Baltimore, Md.	Willamette University, Salem, Ore.



ASSOCIATION BUDGET, 1932

The following tentative budget for the general business, 1932, is recommended for adoption, as follows:

TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR GENERAL WORK, 1932

*Income*

Balance on hand—Bank & Petty Cash, Jan. 1, 1932.....\$ 1,325.24

*Estimated Receipts for the Year, 1932:*

Membership dues—455 at \$50.00 each		
for 1932 .....	\$22,750.00	
Dues in arrears .....	500.00	
		23,250.00
A. A. C. BULLETIN—Sales .....	2,600.00	
The Effective College Sales .....	150.00	
Miscellaneous (including Bank interest, donations, etc.) .....	1,100.00	27,100.00
		<hr/>
		\$28,425.24

*Disbursements*

Annual Meeting .....	\$ 400.00
Dues American Council on Education .....	100.00
Executive Committee Expenses .....	300.00
BULLETIN Publication Expenses .....	3,000.00
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION Subscriptions .....	455.00
Permanent Commissions Expense .....	400.00
Treasurer's Office Expense .....	400.00
Headquarters Office Expense .....	21,213.33
Dr. Kelly's Insurance .....	480.00
The Effective College Distribution .....	25.00
Contingent Fund .....	100.00 26,873.33

Balance on hand January 1, 1933, including Reserve Fund  
of \$1,000 .....\$ 1,551.91\*

*Note:*—The above statement covers general operating expenses only. The Association has on hand \$607.37 of the Carnegie Corporation grant of 1930 (refund of \$107.37 received since January 1, 1932, from author of book) for production of volume on the College Library, held as a special fund.

The General Education Board has appropriated \$25,000 for a study of the Comprehensive Examination. Of this amount the Association has received \$9,438.74 and spent to Dec. 31, 1931, \$6,289.90. There is a balance in the Association treasury of \$3,148.84, as of January 1, 1932. A balance unpaid as yet by the G. E. B. of \$15,561.26.

\* It is hoped that a grant will be received in 1932 for a study of music for the general college student. An expenditure of \$342.13 on preliminary work charged to general budget, 1931, will be a claim on such a grant.

# **THE REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1931**

## **I. CASH TRANSACTIONS**

Balance on hand January 1, 1931:

Regular a/c .....	\$ 5,145.49
Special Time a/c .....	1,500.00
	<hr/> \$ 6,645.49

### *Receipts*

#### **Membership Dues:**

1930— 5 at 50 .....	\$ 250.00
1931—417 at 50 .....	20,850.00
1931— 1 at 5 .....	5.00
1932— 2 at 50 .....	100.00
	<hr/> \$21,205.00

#### **BULLETIN:**

Regular sales .....	\$ 2,439.88
Reprint sales .....	113.00
	<hr/> 2,552.88

<i>The Effective College Sales</i> .....	298.92
Miscellaneous, including Bank Interest .....	353.79
General Education Board a/c Comprehensive Examinations Study .....	9,438.74
	<hr/> \$33,849.33

Total receipts plus bank balance..... \$40,494.82

### *Disbursements*

Annual Meeting .....	\$ 669.10
American Council on Education—Dues .....	100.00
Executive Committee Expenses .....	118.73
Permanent Commissions' Expenses .....	814.16
*Treasurer's Office—Expenses .....	524.66

#### **BULLETIN Publication Expenses:**

Regular a/c .....	\$ 2,756.44
Reprint a/c .....	145.90
	<hr/> 2,902.34

<i>Christian Education Subscriptions</i> .....	438.00
Production of book on "The College Library," Special a/c .....	1,000.00
**Headquarters Office—Expenses .....	22,098.72

## The Activities of the Year

67

Dr. Kelly's Insurance .....	480.00	
The Effective College, Distribution .....	85.13	
Comprehensive Examinations Study .....	6,289.90	35,520.74
<hr/>		
Cash on hand—December 31, 1931:		
In Bank .....	\$ 4,958.18	
Petty Cash .....	15.90	4,974.08
<hr/>		
		\$40,494.82

### Analysis of Cash Balance

The above *balance of cash on hand*, December 31, 1931, includes the following amounts held for special purposes by the Association of American Colleges:

#### *Comprehensive Examination Study*

Received as part payment on total appropriation of \$25,000 .....	\$ 9,438.74	
Payments through December 31, 1931, as shown in the above statement .....	6,289.90	
<hr/>		
Balance on hand, December 31, 1931 .....		\$ 3,148.84

#### *The Book on "The College Library"*

Balance on hand, January 1, 1931, grant from the Carnegie Corporation .....	\$ 1,500.00	
Paid Prof. James T. Gerould .....	1,000.00	
<hr/>		
Balance on hand, December 31, 1931 .....		500.00

#### *General Purposes*

Cash Balance, Association of American Colleges .....	1,325.24	
<hr/>		
		\$ 4,974.08

\* Includes Custodian's fee (\$400.00), clerical service, stationery, bill heads, postage, etc.

\*\* *Expense Headquarters Office*: Credit due from 1930 account, \$891.28, paid during 1931, \$22,098.72—net credits, \$22,990.00. Expended in 1931, \$22,268.66; credit in Office Account, Council of Church Boards of Education, 1932, \$721.34.

## II. GENERAL STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AS OF JANUARY 1, 1932

*Assets*

Cash in Bank, for Association of American Colleges, General Account—January 1, 1932 .....	\$ 1,309.34
Cash in Bank, for Comprehensive Examination Study, January 1, 1932 .....	3,148.84
Cash in Bank, for production of book on "The College Library," January 1, 1932 .....	500.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 4,958.18
Petty Cash in Association Office .....	15.90
Due from Council of Church Boards of Education, a/c overpayment on Headquarters Office Expense..	721.34
Office Furniture and Fixtures, January 1, 1932 .....	1,973.94
	<hr/>
	\$ 7,669.36

*Liabilities and Capital Investments*

Cash in Bank, January 1, 1931 .....	\$ 6,645.49
Less amount held, January 1, 1931, for production of book on "The College Library" .....	1,500.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 5,145.49
Cash held for special purposes, January 1, 1932:	
a/c Comprehensive Examinations Study...	\$ 3,148.84
a/c Book on "The College Library" .....	500.00
	<hr/>
	3,648.84
Office Furniture and Fixtures, January 14, 1931 .....	\$ 1,632.74
Plus amount invested in Furniture and Fixtures during 1931 .....	341.20
	<hr/>
	1,973.94
	<hr/>
	\$10,768.27
Less Net Deficit for 1931:	
Receipts as per cash statement .....	\$33,849.33
Less cash received for special purposes .....	9,438.74
	<hr/>
Net receipts for General Account .....	\$24,410.59
Plus amount due from Council of Church Boards of Education .....	721.34
	<hr/>
	\$25,131.93

## *The Activities of the Year*

69

Disbursements as per		
Cash statements .....	\$35,520.74	
Less payments made for		
special purposes .....	7,289.90	
Total Disbursements for General Ac-		
count .....	28,230.84	
Net Deficit—1931 .....	3,098.91	
		<u>\$ 7,669.36</u>

### III. MEMORANDUM ON MEMBERSHIP DUES

#### A. *Dues in Arrears as of December 31, 1931*

At the close of the fiscal year, December 31, 1931, seventeen colleges were reported in arrears for annual dues for 1931, and two of them also for 1930. Another institution had paid \$5.00 on account. The total amount outstanding was \$995. Since January 1, ten of these colleges have made payments in full or in part, one of the institutions asking that credit be given for 1930.

The college now in arrears for two years, Buena Vista College, Iowa, is by constitutional provision dropped from the roster of the Association.

#### B. *Dues Paid in Advance*

The following colleges have paid dues in advance for 1932:

University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss. ....	\$ 50.00
Rice Institute, Houston, Tex. ....	50.00
	<u>\$100.00</u>

January 7, 1932.

We hereby certify that the statement of cash receipts and disbursements of the Association of American Colleges for the year ended December 31, 1931, submitted herewith by this Company as Custodian of Funds for the said Association, is correct and true, and that the statement of financial condition attached is in our opinion a true statement of the financial condition of the Association of American Colleges as of January 1, 1932.

BANK OF NEW YORK AND TRUST COMPANY, *Custodian of Funds*

By: (Signed) CHARLES ELDREDGE,  
*Vice President*

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) WILLIAM MATHER LEWIS, *Treasurer*

Cincinnati, Ohio.  
January 21, 1932.

THE PRESENT FINANCIAL STATUS OF THE COLLEGE  
Report of the Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds

ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY, *Chairman*

I

REPORTS ON FINANCIAL CONDITIONS

*Comments suggested by the examination of reports  
from 277 Colleges and Universities*

QUESTIONNAIRES are frequently a nuisance. Sometimes they ask for the palpably obvious. More frequently they involve time and investigation which can scarcely be afforded by the person called upon to answer the questions; nearly always they suggest that somebody else proposes to compose an article, possibly for compensation of money or some rewards by way of honor, while the man who has done the painful digging out of source material is unmentioned, unrewarded in any way.

Questionnaires, and investigations, however evil they may be, are nevertheless necessary for the exercise of intelligence and the discovery of wisdom from more than one incident or experience, a wisdom which may be regarded as common, broad, inclusive, and therefore approximately sound and true.

The following suggestions arise naturally after one has read with care a series of replies to a set of questions.

1. The person who receives a questionnaire, if he undertakes to answer it, should in the first place, be quite sure that he understands each question. For example, when the question calls for a statement of default in income, the question is not answered if the principal sum is given on which income may be in default. To put it concretely, if an institution has bonds valued at \$33,500 on which the interest has not been paid, the default in income is not the face value of the bonds, *i.e.*, \$33,500, and the reader of a statement could never tell what the default in income was even if the reply is that the income on this amount of bonds is in default, for is the interest to be reckoned at 4 per cent,  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, 5 per cent, or some other per cent?



Another concrete example:—if the questionnaire relates to endowments, and there is a place for giving figures as to sums which are invested in real estate, to give the value of the campus property or non-income producing buildings, then the answer reveals nothing respecting endowment funds, which are always supposed to be income producing.

2. To send to the questioner a published report with the statement "here is our report, you may dig out the facts for yourself," frequently carries little information to the questioner, for printed reports show all manner of vagaries; in them frequently are classifications and terminology which are peculiar to the institution, or at least not unambiguous.

For a concrete illustration:—one corporation gives in its printed report all of its investments, in the chronological order in which they were made, without specifying whether a name and a sum of money mean a bond, a mortgage, or certain shares of stock.

If a report includes investments held against annuity obligations, this report contains a factor which cannot be determined by the mere statement, for funds against annuity agreements have primary obligations of an insurance kind, dependent upon length of life, and do not represent clear and unattached principal sums.

"Real estate" is an ambiguous term, unless a clear distinction is made between real estate held as an income producing investment and real estate which is merely a tool for doing a piece of educational business.

In this connection it ought to be said, and it should be determined by this Association, that no real estate which is on the college campus or connected directly with the operation of the college, should represent the investment of funds designated as permanent, for funds can be permanent, in a strictly financial sense, only when they are independent of the institution itself and would survive even if the institution perished.

It is evident that published reports must be interpreted so as to fit the terminology of a questionnaire, otherwise they can mean little or nothing; indeed, may be very misleading, if they are simply transferred, as they stand, into the questionnaire. Painful as it may seem to an official, yet there is no way for that

official to report the conditions of his institution unless he is willing to take the time to interpret his own report in the terminology of the questionnaire.

3. If a questionnaire asks for the percentages of income for two successive years, for the sake of comparison between the two years, it will not result in an accurate understanding, if an official fails to make it plain that percentages which he gives are definitely for one or the other of the two years, or if it be the case, the same for the two years, or if there be a variation, that the figure given applies to the second year and not to the earlier year, or *vice versa*, as the case may be. The person answering the questionnaire must read the question put and have his figure placed exactly where it applies. It is not a good comment to make upon the intelligence of a group of educationalists to say that in the simple matter of reporting average percentage of income for two years there is no little confusion and great difficulty in determining what is meant.

4. The reasons given for not sending reports are varied and carry no little suggestiveness. Here are some fair samples:—

- (a) "It would take two weeks of one person's time to dig out the figures which your questionnaire calls for."
- (b) "I have consulted the President and he authorized me to give no information." In reply to a second inquiry, the statement comes, "The President allows me to give the following information." Unfortunately, this information now received was totally unfitted for the forms under which data was to be assembled.
- (c) "There are several large estates which have not yet been assembled in our office and it would be unwise to reveal conditions at present."
- (d) "We send you our printed report. You are at liberty to take from it what you wish."
- (e) "We will send you our report later," and history shows that this last brief statement covers a multitude of sins.

## II

### REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON PERMANENT AND TRUST FUNDS

Reports have been received from 277 colleges and universities holding membership in the Association. Of this number, 19 are Catholic institutions, in some instances wholly sup-

ported by religious orders, and yet six of these 19 institutions have accumulated endowments ranging from \$13,100 to \$564,250, and totaling \$1,346,208. Two of these institutions set a monetary value on the voluntary service rendered by the teaching staff. One estimates the value as equivalent to the income of a fund of one-half million dollars, and the other as equivalent to the income of a fund of \$600,000. Capitalized, therefore, in two instances, the service which is rendered gratuitously, on a religious basis, is reported as equal to \$1,100,000. One Mormon institution may well be classified with these Catholic institutions, inasmuch as it has been in the past entirely, and is now practically, supported from church funds; yet this institution has just set out upon a campaign for endowment and reports \$108,000 as already received.

Thirty-six tax-supported institutions are reported, some supported by the state, some by municipalities. Eighteen of these 33 tax-supported institutions have accumulated endowments ranging from \$24,183 to \$5,303,057, aggregating \$15,535,411. The fact that tax-supported institutions are seeking endowments is noteworthy and should be kept in mind as destined in the course of years to have a profound effect upon the maintenance of other institutions.

To the above, we must add further, a considerable number of institutions which owe their existence to special funds, contributed by an estate, foundation, or from other sources which are not materially subject to fluctuations, either of donations or, in a sense, of investments. We have no exact number of institutions which should go into this group. Not a few regard themselves as so distinct and so independent as to be unable, or unwilling, to furnish reports. Some are so strong as to be in a class by themselves. Setting aside the special groups just referred to, we turn now to a composite picture of about 200 institutions.

As a preliminary, it should be stated that when this investigation was projected nearly a year ago, it was assumed that the crisis of the recent slump and the present depression would have been passed before this time. We all know that the corner has not yet been reached and may not be until much later; and, doubtless, the most serious consequences of the depression upon the financial condition of our educational institutions will be

TABLE I. AGGREGATES OF ENDOWMENTS REPORTED BY COLLEGES, 1930-31.

Area	Bonds	Pfd. Stock	Com. Stock	Mortgages	Real Estate
New England .....	\$ 40,074,057	\$ 4,489,607	\$12,174,173	\$ 9,622,031	\$ 5,873,795
Atlantic .....	79,034,357	14,321,542	7,494,712	19,335,947	8,411,426
Southern .....	33,148,887	1,339,385	2,554,274	16,999,623	7,707,198
Middle Western .....	46,309,105	2,210,163	2,585,239	38,954,697	13,893,808
Far Western .....	4,366,689	780,867	2,207,903	4,046,206	6,287,665
	\$202,933,095	\$23,141,564	\$27,016,301	\$88,958,504	\$42,173,892

  

Area	Notes	Miscellaneous	Totals	Unclassified
New England .....	\$	\$ 994,495	\$ 73,238,158	\$ 3,350,641
Atlantic .....	1,074,667	4,443,603	134,116,254	65,280,646
Southern .....	1,315,547	4,529,937	67,594,851	
Middle Western .....	1,438,438	11,929,331	117,320,781	17,127,661
Far Western .....	137,010	847,033	18,673,373	
	\$ 3,965,662	\$22,744,399	\$410,933,417	\$85,758,948
		Unclassified .....	\$ 85,758,948	
		One institution .....	117,204,250	
			\$613,896,615	

Approximately 50.0% of the 410 millions is invested in bonds, *i.e.*, 49.26%.

" " 21.7% in Mortgages.

" " 10.4% in Real Estate.

" " 5.13% in Common Stock.

" " 5.06% in Preferred Stock.

" " 5.06% in Miscellaneous.

" " 0.96% in Notes.

found to have been as late as some time in 1932, and possibly later. It must be borne in mind, then, that the momentum of past prosperity carried our institutions for the most part quite comfortably through the last fiscal year, which for most of the colleges closed during the summer of 1931.

The institutions are grouped geographically, in five areas—the New England States, the Atlantic States, the Southern States, the Middle Western States and the Far Western States. The institutions here combined possess reported endowment funds of \$663,957,486.

In these five areas endowments, as reported, are found in Table I. The New England States, 17 institutions reporting, show a default in income of but \$47,180 and a default in principal of \$73,205. The Far Western States—24 institutions—report default in income of \$51,100 and a default in principal of \$129,630. The Atlantic States—41 institutions—report default in income of \$129,815 and default in principal of \$257,947. The Southern States—69 institutions—report default in income of \$305,314 and default in principal of \$1,273,921, and the report of the Middle Western States—64 institutions—shows a default in income of \$481,652 and default in principal of \$2,000,649. These figures totalized, covering the last fiscal year, show from the institutions reporting a default in income of \$1,015,061 and a default in principal of \$3,825,382.

These figures mean that, so far as the reports reveal conditions, there was no alarming shrinkage in either income or invested funds during the last fiscal year. It may be granted that our figures do not include some of the weaker institutions, which did not report. At the same time, our figures do not include some of the strongest institutions in the country, which did not report, or the reports of which were so published through classifications and combinations as to make it impossible to include them in our figures. We cannot manufacture reports, nor accurately interpret reports the terminology of which, and the classification of which, are not according to standard uses, or adapted to the questionnaire which we sent out. We are summarizing to you the reports which have been received and are using our best judgment in interpreting them.

The figures just given to you indicate that the institutions of New England have not been seriously affected, nor have the institutions in what we term the Atlantic States, nor those along the Far Western seaboard. The real losses of considerable size are in the South and the Middle West.

The largest losses have been made by the institutions which have centralized their investments chiefly upon land values and upon real estate, quite generally in their immediate neighborhood. Quite a large number of institutions in the South and in the Middle West, chiefly the smaller or the medium sized, have more than 50 per cent of their investment in some way tied up with local land values. Three of the institutions report every dollar of their permanent funds invested in mortgages; and three others have their entire endowments invested in real estate, with figures reported as follows:—of one, \$2,184,500; of another, \$138,540; and the third, \$800,000, making a total of \$3,123,040 invested in real estate. The figures given indicate that this real estate is regarded as endowment and is the form of security in which permanent funds have been invested.

A noteworthy feature of these reports is that so far as income from tuition is concerned, student attendance has increased with the advancement of the period of depression. Of 227 institutions which reported the amount of tuition received, 127 show a decided increase; 29 report a practically static condition; 71 show a decrease of receipts for tuition, and in some instances with corresponding compensation in special gifts, either for running expenses, building operations, capital funds or other specified purposes.

There is apparent a slight decrease in the percentage of returns on invested funds, usually not more than one-tenth or two-tenths of one per cent. The percentage of returns still reported will average well above 5 per cent the country over, and in some instances an actual increase of percentage is shown. For example, one college, which reported the average yield of its investments as 6.9 per cent in the year ending June, 1930, reports an increase to 7.6 per cent in the year closing last June. Usually, however, the changes are toward a very slightly reduced average yield. The lowest average return reported in any instance is 2.3 per cent.



The decrease of reported percent earnings in different sections is as follows:—

TABLE II. DECREASED EARNINGS OF CAPITAL FUNDS REPORTED BY 197 COLLEGES, 1931.

Area	Institutions	Yield in 1929-30	Yield in 1930-31
		%	%
New England .....	14	5.16	5.02
Atlantic States .....	38	5.24	5.19
Southern States .....	51	5.48	5.39
Middle Western States .....	75	5.10	5.02
Far Western .....	19	5.487	5.33
	197	5.268	5.06 (5.0599)

For all of these institutions—197, the decrease is from 5.27 per cent to 5.06 per cent.

The greatest losses and the most frequent instance of uncertainty, not yet surely proving losses, lie in the field of mortgages and of real estate. The strongest financial position is shown by those institutions which have a fair diversification of investments, with bonds, conservatively selected, leading the list.

New England shows a total loss of income of but \$47,180. New England's investments are predominantly in bonds and there begins to be a fairly large showing of stocks, both common and preferred. The New England colleges, 17 here reporting, show a default of income on bonds of but \$15,978, on preferred stocks of only \$229, on common stocks of but \$13,704 and on mortgages of but \$3,675. The Atlantic States, 41 institutions here reporting, show a default of income on bonds of \$102,672, on preferred stocks of \$10,586, on common stocks of \$3,179 and on mortgages of \$12,830. In the Southern States the default of interest as reported by 69 institutions, is \$90,848, the default of income on preferred stocks \$33,244, on common stocks \$12,265 and on mortgages \$133,922. In the Middle West the default of income, reported by 64 institutions, on bonds is \$131,151, on preferred stocks \$6,465, on common stocks \$17,313 and on mortgages \$304,736. In the Far Western States the combined figures of 24 institutions are, default of income on bonds \$17,808, on preferred stocks \$8,396, on common stocks nothing and on mortgages \$30,016.

TABLE III. GIFTS REPORTED RECEIVED BY 210 COLLEGES, 1930-31.

Area	Run. Exp.	Perm. Imp.	Capital	Others	Total
New England .....	\$ 339,326	\$ 538,312	\$ 2,429,057	\$ 502,312	\$ 3,809,007
	14 reported 6 gained 7 lost				
Atlantic .....	1,780,468	23,592,577	5,831,964	2,421,885	33,626,892
	40 reported 15 gained 13 lost				
Southern .....	1,499,152	1,942,505	783,363	176,752	4,401,772
	57 reported 18 gained 33 lost				
Middle Western .....	2,435,447	2,980,856	3,937,343	1,273,854	10,627,500
	77 reported 23 gained 51 lost				
Far Western .....	648,156	979,096	559,519	149,003	2,335,774
	22 reported 10 gained 12 lost				
	210 reported 72 gained 126 lost	\$30,033,346	\$13,741,246	\$4,023,806	\$54,800,945
		\$6,702,549			

These figures do not show serious losses nor an alarming condition.

As already stated, the very serious condition, if there be such a condition, would doubtless appear when the current year, ending in the summer of 1932, is reviewed.

Figures representing gifts are encouraging. Of 210 institutions reporting, 72 showed an actual increase in the amount of gifts received over the preceding year, while 126 showed a decrease. Classified according to the geographical areas, and classified also according to objects for which gifts were made, whether for running expenses, for permanent improvements, for capital funds or for other purposes, the accompanying table, No. III, shows results as reported.

One who has read the reports of these 277 institutions with care, could tell a great many things about the financial strength or weakness of many institutions, but it was agreed at the outset that no institution should be singled out, and no names should be given. Some of the most interesting facts are not reducible to averages or percentages because figures, though given, are not complete nor perfectly intelligible, and yet, at the same time, figures which are not complete and are not intelligible, do reveal a good deal to a thoughtful mind.

A large amount of patience and painstaking care have been put into the returns for which the Commission is, and the Association should be, grateful.

It must be stated that none of these figures given can be regarded as final or complete. They are but samples, which show current trends and not total aggregations.

---

#### COMPENSATORY EFFECTS OF THE DEPRESSION

After the presentation of my report to the Association of American Colleges on the present financial condition of members of the Association, there came to me a number of encouraging additional statements which should be passed on to others.

One college reported default of income not exceeding \$1,000 during the last fiscal year, and then made known a positive advantage which had accrued to the college in its building pro-

gram. When contracts had been received and signed, the administration found that a building for which \$600,000 had been provided, could be built for less than \$500,000, thereby saving a clear \$100,000 for uses of the college.

The president of another institution reported that in a similar manner a building which he had expected to erect for about \$250,000 and thought might possibly cost as much as \$300,000 had actually been contracted for at prices somewhat less than \$200,000.

Another institution, with investment funds of more than seventeen millions of dollars, reported default in income as less than \$4,600.

A curious situation developed not in the same class of encouraging tokens, which should also be passed along. In the report it had been stated that one institution had blanketed its whole campus property with a mortgage for about two-thirds of the value of the property and had sold bonds, secured by this mortgage, and then had used up the proceeds of this bond issue in its debts and its running expenses; that it has literally "eaten itself up." It was stated, however, that probably this institution could continue in operation because no one would wish to foreclose on the mortgage inasmuch as the property could not now be converted into cash. College campuses and buildings are not in the nature of quick assets. Then, too, there are three ways of reducing cost or of securing funds, to keep in operation: (1) the faculty may work for nothing, or next to nothing, (2) tuition fees may be increased, or may as they are, suffice to keep the institution running at least for a time, and (3) friends and supporters may contribute money enough to keep it in operation or even to pull it out of its morass.

After this statement, it curiously enough happened that the President of a college came to me and said, "Do you mean my institution?" The reply was, "No, not yours, but another" and then that President remarked, "Well, I am not to blame for the situation, I inherited it and I am trying to pull out of it without letting my public know the dire straits in which we are placed. Please do not mention our name."

And then, a little later, a gentleman came to me quite insistent that I should tell him the name of the institution referred to. I declined to do so on the ground that I had received all of the

information in a confidential way and did not intend to make any disclosures as to specific institutions. Then he suggested, one after the other, the names of two institutions to which my remarks might perhaps apply. It is possible, therefore, that more institutions have "eaten themselves up" than any one is aware of. I should be glad to have the names of such institutions reported to me, if there be any, and I solemnly agree not to disclose the names to anyone outside of the office of the Association of American Colleges.

It is doubtless true that the American colleges, taken as a whole, are in as favorable a financial condition as any group of institutions in our country. Certainly, on the whole, they are more prosperous than most lines of business, more prosperous even than distinctly financial corporations or banks and trust companies. Very few of them are in an actually precarious condition because of the depression. Those whose financial foundation seems unsettled have probably been in this condition for several years and probably owe their defects either to faulty location, to a too-keen competition from other institutions near at hand, or from some mismanagement dating, it may be, from a rather remote distance in time.—A. W. A.

---

#### CHARITY AID IN 1931

The John Price Jones Corporation, keeping tabs on statements made in the public press, report as given in the New York Times of January 3, 1932, that direct philanthropic gifts in the United States in 1931 probably exceeded \$1,500,000,000. Five cities gave an aggregate of \$344,355,000 for the year, made up of gifts each of which was more than \$25,000. The cities were New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington. Of this sum of \$344,355,000—\$215,577,268 were bequests.

Experience shows that it is fair to estimate that gifts for philanthropy in other parts of the country in substantial amounts approximate \$948,157,732, and that private benefactions not finding mention in the public press, amounted to at least \$40,000,000. Ordinary contributions to churches and religious institutions, most of which is privately given, run into as much as \$1,000,000,000; therefore the total aggregate estimated by the John Price Jones Corporation of contributions to charity in all its forms in 1931 probably exceeded \$1,500,000,000.

## REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE ENLISTMENT AND TRAINING OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

JAMES L. McCONAUGHY, *Chairman*

PRESIDENT OF WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

SINCE its appointment in 1926, this Commission has directed its attention to one of the topics of major concern to all colleges: the recruiting and training of able new teachers. During the past three years it has studied two phases of this problem: in 1929, the training in graduate schools of persons preparing for positions on college faculties and the training of young college instructors; in 1930, the recruiting, within the college, of promising undergraduates for this profession. During the past ten months the Commission has been engaged in a study of the number and quality of the recruits for college teaching who have graduated, in the last ten classes, from each of the member institutions of this Association. The resolution, passed at the Annual Meeting last January, directed the Commission to undertake—

a factual inquiry, designed to ascertain with regard to the graduates of each college which is a member of this Association: (1) the actual number of members of each of the last ten graduating classes who are engaged in or preparing for college teaching, and the percentage of the class represented by this number; and (2) the actual number of persons in the upper quarter of each of the same ten classes who are engaged in or preparing for college teaching, and the percentage of those in the upper quarter of the class represented by this number.

The response to the inquiry was very gratifying—replies being received from five-sixths of the colleges enrolled in the Association. Interest in the inquiry and a spirit of genuine cooperation were evidenced not only by the very generous response but by the cordiality with which those unable to send the data expressed their regret (83 colleges took the trouble to reply that they wished to cooperate but could not) and by the eagerness with which many submitted comments which seemed to them pertinent. The Commission wishes to express to the Association its appreciation of the cordial response to this investigation.\*

\* The statistical work of this report was done by members of the Association Office staff. The tabulations were made by Mrs. Josephine McGleenan, and percentages worked out by Mr. William Guy.



In the preparation of the present report some serious problems have been confronted.

I. *Difficulties found by the Colleges:*

(1) Inadequate records. A considerable number of institutions, by no means the least bountifully endowed and equipped, reported that their alumni records were inadequate. Indeed, one of the significant findings of the Commission is the general ignorance, on the part of the colleges, of the professional distribution of their alumni.

(2) Insufficient personnel. To some, the report blank which the Commission thought rather simple, seemed formidable. Many colleges found that the time required of its staff to prepare the report was not available. In the case of the larger institutions, the checking of alumni lists involved no inconsiderable labor and was an undoubted burden. One university wrote: "To secure the information requested would require the work of one clerk for perhaps more than one month."

(3) The brevity of the inquiry and the phrasing of the blank. Many colleges were seriously troubled by the inquiry itself. One college felt it advisable to report the *living* class enrolment for each year; some colleges found it impossible to separate alumni who *had taught* from the number known to be teaching at the present time; others could not estimate with any degree of approximation satisfactory to themselves the number of recent graduates who were *preparing* for college teaching. The president of one woman's college made interesting comment at this point:

I am appending a column containing a number of those who have taught in colleges, but have stopped, and a number of those who have prepared themselves for college teaching, but have not taught. In both cases, most of them have married. My observation is that the very qualities in the personalities of young women that make them fitted for college work are also the qualities that attract men who are seeking wives.

The Commission feels that the fact that so large a number of colleges unable to supply the data took the trouble to advise us to that effect, is a remarkable evidence of the vitality and good-

will represented in Association membership and is a cause for encouragement, rather than the opposite. The conscientious and cheerful checking, sometimes a second and third time, of many who did report is very heartening.

## II. *Difficulties found by the Commission:*

(1) Failure of college officers to read the communication, including the blank, carefully. As soon as the reports began to come back, it was discovered that the number of "college teachers" reported per class was in many instances extraordinarily large—quite out of proportion to the probable facts in the case. One member reported that in the year 1922, out of a class of 51, 49 entered the field of "college teaching." Subsequent correspondence reduced the number to 9. Presumably, other types of teaching had been included. This confusion occurred with great frequency and among the leading institutions.

Other colleges, responding cordially with correct data on professional distribution, failed to note the essential purpose of the inquiry in discovering the quality of new recruits, and gave the total number of students in the first quarter of each class or otherwise of high rank instead of the number of graduates of high intellectual ability who were interested in the profession of college teaching.

A few colleges used two or more of the measures, intended to be mutually exclusive, which were suggested in the report—first quarter, honors, Phi Beta Kappa—making it difficult to avoid overlapping. When in doubt, the figures most advantageous to the college were used in the tables.

(2) Altering the blank. Not a few colleges modified the column headings and reported graduates of the School of Education, the number of those "receiving Teachers' Certificates" for ten years, etc.—data incomparable with the reports from other colleges.

In order to eliminate misunderstanding and to make the tabulations as accurate as possible, a considerable correspondence developed, conducted through the office of the Secretary of the Association. When the percentage of college teachers to the total number of graduates ran above 12 per cent, further information was sought.

The two following general comments may be noted:

(A) The number of Catholic lay graduates who enter the teaching profession is relatively small. Many reasons may be assigned, but the principal one is that, as a rule, Catholics who feel the call to teach enter some teaching religious order. In some instances the field for such teachers is narrow. One of the significant findings, however, is the remarkable frequency of 100 per cent high standing among the Catholic college teacher recruits.

(B) The Commission is convinced that figures used in this report very certainly understate the situation. Even though errors in reporting may have been undetected, and allowing for conditions in the South, where many junior colleges have been established in the past ten years and the number of recruits is large, the omission elsewhere of data on those preparing for college teaching was so frequent as to offset these reports. Furthermore, many colleges distinctly reported that their figures understate the facts.

The tables which follow indicate that approximately 5 per cent of all the graduates in the colleges represented in this Association during the last decade are teaching in colleges, or preparing therefor. The intellectual quality of these present and future teachers is high; over one-half of those who have chosen college teaching as their life work graduated in the upper quarter of the class. Furthermore, approximately one-tenth of all the honor graduates chose to become college teachers. Where separate figures for men and women are given, no noteworthy differences between the two groups were found, in numbers, percentage of total graduates, or quality of the recruits. Although the figures were given for each of the last ten years, the Commission could find no observable trend, toward either a decrease or an increase in the number of recruits, nor any evidence of a change in quality.

Since the Commission's factual study was begun, economic conditions in the profession have changed markedly. Fewer faculty resignations were tendered last summer than for years; more applications from apparently qualified teachers reach our desks than previously; more teachers with experience are unemployed than for many a decade; young people seeking their first positions have, in very many cases, failed to obtain appointments.

In view of these facts—which will probably not change for the better for at least another year—inquiry may well be raised whether we do not now have teachers enough, and whether we are wise to urge promising college students to consider college teaching as their life work. However, the Commission believes that these conditions are temporary, that additional positions will be open before long, and that the present change in economic conditions justifies college executives in placing greater emphasis, in the filling of faculty positions, on quality of training and personality than ever before. When appointments of incompetent teachers terminate, their places should be filled by abler, more promising candidates. Difficult as such changes always are, the profession must command the ablest men and women it can secure—or it loses its greatest distinction. Accordingly, we may wisely urge our outstanding students to consider and prepare for college teaching, confident that those properly qualified will be satisfactorily placed.

To assist such recruits, the Commission reasserts its recommendation of last year: that a book or booklet be prepared, under Association auspices, for the benefit of undergraduates interested in the possibility of preparing for college teaching. The efforts of the Commission to accomplish this during the past year failed, because we found that a subvention would be necessary, and no funds were available; furthermore, we could not find the right author or editor. We fear that similar difficulties may beset future Commissions. However, the Commission is willing to undertake the preparation of such a pamphlet, if the Association should signify its approval of such action. In such a case, the Commission would hope to persuade the present President of the Association to modify slightly and expand the parts of last year's Report—which came entirely from his pen—which discussed the factors in the profession which should appeal to undergraduates. Such a pamphlet could be prepared and sold at cost to institutions desiring to place it before selected students; we believe the response would be large and the proposal worth attempting.

In view of the possibility that the economic difficulties now facing administrators and teachers may seem depressing to some, we call attention to the recent study of the supply of elementary and

secondary school teachers, contained in the November, 1931, *Research Bulletin* of the National Education Association. The figures therein prove that although there is, in some states, an oversupply of teachers, there would be no oversupply, but an unfilled demand, if the standards for admission to the profession were universally as high as all agree they should be, and as some states now maintain. This *Bulletin* shows that all teachers would be employed, if the unfit were eliminated, and if those deficient in ability and personality were discouraged from attempting to prepare for the profession. College teaching, we believe, faces the same situation. Unless colleges are willing to lower the quality of their work, and their product, we must eliminate the unfit and deter the unpromising. For example, if *all*—instead of only half, as for the last ten years—of the recruits for college positions came from the upper quarter of the graduating class, we believe we should have abler teachers. To lure the most promising recruits, we must bend every effort, even in hard times, to improve the profession by providing salaries adequate for comfortable family living and protection for old age, with fitting recognition of superiority within the group, and suitable opportunities for freedom and growth.

## SUMMARY OF TEN YEAR STUDY\*

Number of blanks sent out by the Commission (to all members of the Association) .....	436
Colleges that made no reply .....	73
<b>Total number of replies to the inquiry .....</b>	<b>363</b>
Colleges reporting inability to furnish the data .....	83
Colleges whose reports were obviously incomparable with others, omitted from tabulation .....	18
Colleges responding with data for 5 years only .....	12
<b>Total number of reports filed and tabulated .....</b>	<b>250</b>

Table I shows for the ten year period, 1921-1930, the total number of graduates with Bachelor's degree, reported by 250 colleges, the number and per cent of the same engaged in or preparing for college teaching, and the number and per cent of the latter who were of high academic rank.

\* Tables giving ten-year totals for individual colleges will be found in the Appendix, p. 147.

Table II shows the same facts with reference to 129 colleges which reported for men and women separately.

The colleges were grouped according to their inclusion in lists of the standard accrediting agencies for 1930-31 (spring), because it was believed that in preparation for college work, the character of the collegiate background was a significant feature.

TABLE I  
GRADUATES OF 250 COLLEGES ENGAGED IN OR PREPARING FOR COLLEGE  
TEACHING, 1921-1930

	Number of Colleges Reporting	Total Number of Graduates with Bachelor's Degree	Number now Engaged in or Preparing for College Teaching	Per Cent	Number of These who Were in Upper Quarter of Class, or Recognized Otherwise as of Superior Intellectual Ability	Per Cent
Accredited by the Association of American Universities .....	126	129,194	6,022	4.6	3,145	52.2
Accredited by Regional Associations .....	95	50,947	2,613	5.1	1,494	56.2
Others .....	29	8,300	528	6.3	381	72.1
Total .....	250	188,441	9,163	4.8	5,020	54.5

Of the 188,441 graduates in 250 colleges in the ten years 1921-1930, 9,163, or 4.8 per cent, are reported as now engaged in or preparing for college teaching. Of these, 5,020, or 54.5 per cent, were reported as of superior intellectual ability.

More than one-half of the colleges reporting (129) reported as to men and women separately. Of the 38,079 men graduates reported by the colleges, 2,437 or 6.4 per cent are engaged in or preparing for the profession of college teaching; of these, 1,179, or 48.3 per cent, were reported as of superior intellectual ability. Of the 56,286 women graduates, 2,313, or 4.1 per cent, were re-



ported as engaged in or preparing for college teaching; of these, 1,111, or 48 per cent, are of high rank.

TABLE II  
MEN AND WOMEN GRADUATES OF 129 COLLEGES ENGAGED IN OR PREPARING  
FOR COLLEGE TEACHING, 1921-1930

	Number of Colleges Reporting	Total Number of Graduates with Bachelor's Degree	Number now Engaged in or Preparing for College Teaching	Per Cent	Number of These who Were in Upper Quarter of Class, or Recognized Otherwise as Superior Intellectual Ability	Per Cent
Accredited by the Association of American Universities .....	66	M27,740 W36,140	1,447 1,493	5.2 4.1	705 646	48.7 43.2
Accredited by Regional Associations .....	53	M9,172 W18,828	881 753	9.6 4.0	389 421	44.1 55.9
Others .....	10	M1,167 W1,318	109 67	9.3 5.1	85 44	77.9 65.7
Total .....	129	M38,079 W56,286	2,437 2,313	6.4 4.1	1,179 1,111	48.3 48.0

As a result of its investigation the Commission has reached the following conclusions:

- (1) The colleges are not well informed concerning their product. They might keep in closer touch with their alumni to mutual advantage.
- (2) The colleges are not recruiting college teachers seriously. They are training secondary school teachers in considerable numbers but are not yet "college conscious" on this point. There is evident need for the emphasis that has been placed upon this matter by the Association. We again urge the preparation of a book or pamphlet on the attractions of college teaching.

- (3) The colleges should stress quality more than they have done hitherto. While present conditions render the enlistment phase of the general situation somewhat different from what it was a year ago, nevertheless, the need of *good* college teachers has not diminished.
- (4) It will be wise for the Association to continue to keep the matter of enlistment and training of college teachers at the fore, and the Commission recommends the cordial cooperation of this Association with the American Association of University Professors, which is now enabled by a subvention from the Carnegie funds to make a serious study of the problems involved.

---

#### CREATIVE EDUCATION

*Charles R. Mann:* Your article on the "Creative Education in the College" in the December issue of your *Bulletin* is admirable. The colleges can make a great hit if they will seriously take hold of the idea of fusing the liberal and the practical in their work.

*William J. Hutchins:* I am personally grateful for your pamphlet, "Creative Education in the College," from which I expect to quote in speaking to our general faculty.

*James H. Tufts:* I have read "Creative Education in the College" with much interest, for despite the gloomy predictions of some who foresee the early demise of the college, I cannot think that so important an institution has ceased to be needed. . . . It would be unfortunate, I believe, if we should lose the institution which for great numbers gives at once a meeting place of young people preparing for all walks of life, and a contact with the cultural values of all ages to help in "living nobly and well."

*Peyton Jacob:* I have just read "Creative Education in the College." It presents an alluring picture of an education that one could well wish for everybody. Hardly a sentence in it failed to call forth a hearty *Amen*. There is not one with which I disagree.

*Henry Smith Leiper:* The sweep and inclusiveness of your discussion of "Creative Education in the College" is stimulating and thought compelling.

*Walter A. Jessup:* I have read with great delight your address on Creative Education. I took occasion to read it to the Director of our School of Fine Arts. I think this is about the finest statement on the subject I have seen and I certainly congratulate you.

*Carl W. Ackerman:* I appreciate . . . even more the philosophy which you are giving to the students of this country.

## REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL SURVEYS

FRANK L. McVEY, *Chairman*

PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

THE Commission on Educational Surveys has presented reports at the last three meetings of the Association. In the statement which is made today it is proposed to summarize the main points in a group of college surveys, and having done this to make its bow to the Association. Not that there is lack of material and opportunity for further consideration of questions in the field of educational surveys, but rather that the Commission has done all that can be expected at this time.

The material for the Commission's report of 1932 was gathered by the office of the Association, and analyzed by Professor F. M. Heston of Asbury College. The summary of the college surveys incorporates the ideas and much of the language used by Professor Heston in his study. The various statements that form this report are based on the results of eighteen different surveys in 167 different colleges.

To begin with, a good deal of consideration is given to the supporting organizations and constituencies of colleges as well as their location. All the surveys emphasize the importance of supporting colleges in an effective way. The denominations must choose among increased support, consolidation with other institutions, or their abandonment. Any church which wishes to equalize the support it gives its institutions should have its funds brought together in a central office. The problem of support is affected by the location and clientele of the institution. It is pointed out by the various reports that the chief factors to be considered are the source of students, the distance they come to attend college, the educational environment, including the economic condition of the community, the possibility of expansion in the present location and the wisdom of finding a new location and plant, when measured by the value of the present plant, its sentimental attachments and the possibility for service under new conditions.

In a few instances colleges are not fully accredited and some of these institutions will not be able to meet the accrediting

standards. When that is the case, these surveys do not hesitate to say that the institution should close its doors. Attention is also called to catalog statements regarding accrediting. No institution should print statements to the effect that it is accredited by the American Council on Education or the Association of American Colleges. Neither one of these associations is engaged in the business of accrediting.

The intelligent planning and effective operation of colleges require that those responsible for their work should know what they are endeavoring to do. The statement of aims presented by these institutions lacks definiteness. The programs are not clear cut and do not show a satisfactory understanding of an educational objective in the surveys. Every institution should have departmental and course objectives, and when the institution can not find the necessary funds and facilities to offer a high type on the college level, the college should drop down to a lower level, restrict its program and limit its enrolment; consolidate with another institution, or seek affiliation with a university. It may find a new location or it may discontinue as an institution. The survey experts often make recommendations regarding control and administration.

It seems strange when so much is known about boards and organizations, that it should be necessary to emphasize the right of boards to freedom of expression and to limit the numbers to not more than fifteen members. In some cases the primary responsibility of boards is to make provision for funds. In other cases, considerable emphasis is given to the necessity for unity in the administrative offices, and in commenting upon the need of an advisory council, these surveys point out the value of them and the functions they fill. In publicity, say the surveys, all that is being done should emphasize the scholarly productions of professors, what is being offered by the institution, rather than intercollegiate athletics.

In the main, all the eighteen survey groups state that the faculty is the heart of the institution. They warn against too much in-breeding, and insist that the minimum requirements for college teaching should be met by all members of the staff. The ratio of faculty to students should be one to twelve, possibly one to fifteen, though some of them state that where only limited

funds are available this ratio might be placed higher, if there is effective teaching. Large classes will be better taught by better teachers than smaller classes by poorer teachers. This means the payment of larger salaries, rather than an increase in the number of teachers. Promotion in rank rather than increase in pay, should be avoided.

A great deal of attention is given in these surveys to instruction and its improvement. In general, the number of departments should be reduced by grouping related subjects in larger divisions. Fields of concentration would then replace major and minor group requirements, with a central authority for directing the study of problems. There should be supervision of immature and inexperienced teachers, class room visitation, and provision may be made for departmental communities with conference rooms, offices and class rooms grouped about a departmental library, and with all these there should be encouragement of research in the institution.

Nearly all the surveys use the phrase "student personnel," which includes both promotion and admission of students. The emphasis of the studies is upon the ability of the college student, the college standing and the process of selecting superior students. This places upon the registrar a new function. The survey of the Lutheran colleges sets up particularly standards for the registrar's office. Student counseling is regarded as part of the educational process, and in larger institutions the surveys recommend the appointment of a director. Along with these considerations are comments upon the obligations of colleges to maintain health programs and psychiatric clinics.

In the matter of teacher training, the surveys recognize it as a function of the liberal arts college. Professional courses should be placed in the upper division of the college. The surveys specify special methods as against general methods in the maintenance of teacher training and supervisory teaching. The institution should maintain a demonstration school in which the student does his observation and supervised teaching.

Comments on the curriculum emphasize the education of the individual student and the surveys also state that there should be centralization within a relatively few fields and a reasonable sequence within these fields. The colleges ought to draw sharper

lines between upper and lower division students when upper students take lower division courses.

Along with the problem of instruction the surveys give consideration to the importance of the library. These surveys emphasize the centralization of library administration and state that the budget for libraries should be about six per cent of the total of the college budget.

More attention is given to financial problems than to any other group of problems. Speaking broadly, institutions are either under-supported or offer more extensive programs than their resources justify. These surveys set up standards for the computation of financial needs. The reports on financing and accounting have a good deal to say about endowment funds and their freedom from violation. The surveys find that many colleges are lax in their accounting methods and that they do not handle their endowment funds with care. On this matter of endowment funds it is suggested that small institutions secure expert management through the formation of an investment trust by a group of institutions, or the employment of a trust company to manage the institution's funds.

In general, the surveys recommend the increase of student fees to a point where the student pays sixty to seventy per cent of the current educational costs. Surveys favor a reduction in the number of scholarships and increased revolving loan funds. As a final consideration the surveys emphasize the importance of keeping current expenses in strict and sound budgetary control.

The program of physical education and athletics should provide a wider range of activities, and more attention should be given to the corrective and recreative functions of physical education. Through the intramural athletics program college athletics should be made a part of physical education, and in all instances, the faculty should control finances, schedule making and eligibility. The coaches should be members of the instructional staff. The surveys look with disfavor upon graduate managers and the subsidization of athletes by alumni, as well as the establishment of athletic scholarships. The surveys also have something to say about extracurricular activities and emphasize the importance of their control through the charter system and the use of the point system for limiting the participation



of students. Any fraternity or organization which raises problems in the institution does not justify its existence. In any institution this is to be decided by the administration with the cooperation of the students.

In the matter of religious life the surveys insist the denominational schools must place a new emphasis upon religious influence and training. The institutions should offer unified programs with as wide participation as possible and there ought to be facilities for such training through the college church or through an arrangement with the community church.

These are the points made in the study of surveys in which some of the prominent experts in the field of education have taken part, such as Presidents Capen, Zook and Kelly, and Professors Strayer, Engelhardt, Reeves, Russell, Ford and others.

The Commission desires to indicate its obligation to the office of the Association, to Mr. Archie Palmer for his personal services, to Dr. Kelly for his wise advice, and to Professor Heston of Asbury College, for his assistance in making this report.

---

## A PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

RAYMOND WALTERS  
DEAN OF SWARTHMORE COLLEGE

I DESIRE, at the outset, to make it clear that the proposed classification of institutions of higher education, copies of which you have in hand, is distinctly not a new accrediting list and that the several groups are not differentiated or ranked in respect to educational excellence.

The classification aims simply to be a common-sense response to requests received by the Association of American Colleges which have been referred by Dr. Kelly, Executive Secretary of the Association, and President Cowling, Chairman of the National Committee on Standard Reports, to the present speaker as a man having a practical knowledge of collegiate statistics and administration.

My purpose is to classify the leading types of institutions of higher education in the United States so that statistics regarding them may be presented in as convenient and illuminating a fashion as possible. For administrators to have financial and administrative data about institutions of like character and to know enrolment trends in these and other colleges and universities has become increasingly necessary in these difficult days. For example, as purveyor of enrolment statistics I had both last year and this an unusual number of telegraphic and other hurry-up appeals for advance figures from legislative committees and college and university presidents and deans. Even more in the future than in the past it seems probable that study of data and trends will help to determine institutional policy.

There are several avenues of statistical information to which collegiate administrators especially turn and for which the proposed classification may be useful:

1. The first in scope and magnitude is embodied in the biennial survey of education in the United States, prepared by the Statistical Division of the Office of Education. The tables of this bulletin give summaries of instructors and students in universities, colleges and professional schools and also details about

each institution such as the values of library, scientific apparatus, grounds, buildings, endowment funds, receipts from all sources, tuition fees, etc. The property and financial data are particularly valuable because they are seldom summarized elsewhere. It would make this biennial bulletin still more valuable if, instead of its present arrangement, the material were presented in classifications which would enable the inquiring administrator to see grouped together all of the institutions of his own type. He could compare data more quickly and more satisfactorily. I understand that the Office of Education welcomes a classification acceptable to those in the fields of higher education.

2. A second avenue of statistical information in which a new classification might be utilized is the volume, "American Universities and Colleges," which was first published by the American Council on Education in 1926 under the editorship of Dr. David A. Robertson and which will shortly have a new edition to be edited by Dr. John H. MacCracken.

3. A third avenue is in such publication as the annual *School and Society* report which has the November 1 enrolment of some 440 approved institutions in print by the middle of December. Dr. J. McKeen Cattell, editor of *School and Society*, and the compiler of the annual report would both be glad hereafter to use the proposed classification if it is adopted. Another similar use of the classification might be in the annual statistical report of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, published about August and giving enrolments and numbers of degrees granted in the preceding June.

4. A fourth avenue is the approved lists published by the various accrediting agencies: the Association of American Universities and the regional associations such as those of the Middle States, the North Central, and the Southern States. Certain officers of some of these associations who have been so good as to look over my proposed classification have expressed personal approval of it.

I would interpolate here that I sent this classification to some thirty collegiate registrars, deans, presidents and others in all parts of the country and have had responses from practically

every one of them. Their comments are favorable far beyond my expectations.

May I now ask you to look at the accompanying sheets?

PROPOSED CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

I. UNIVERSITIES (Coeducational unless otherwise indicated)

A. Institutions of Complex Organization Having a Graduate School, Certain Professional Schools, and an Undergraduate College\*

1. Under Public Control

*e.g.* Universities of California, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, etc.

2. Under Private Control

*e.g.* Chicago, Columbia, Harvard (Men), Yale (Men), etc.

B. Institutions of Less Complex Organization Having Certain Graduate Courses, Professional or Technological Schools, and an Undergraduate College\*

1. Under Public Control

*e.g.* Universities of Arizona, Florida, Vermont, etc.

2. Under Private Control

*e.g.* Brown, Syracuse, Vanderbilt, etc.

II. COLLEGES OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Institutions Primarily Offering Curricula Leading to the B.A. or B.S. Degrees (Under Private Control, unless otherwise indicated).

1. Coeducational Colleges

*e.g.* Carleton, Middlebury, Oberlin, Swarthmore, etc.

2. Colleges for Men

*e.g.* Amherst, Hamilton, Williams, U. of the South, etc.

3. Colleges for Women

*e.g.* Bryn Mawr, Mills, Sweetbriar, Smith, etc.

III. TECHNOLOGICAL-PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTIONS (Coeducational unless otherwise indicated) Independent Colleges or Schools Offering Curricula Leading to degrees in Engineering, Agriculture, Education, etc.

---

\* At a meeting in Washington, D. C., on February 23, the official committee, consisting of Dean Walters, Chancellor S. P. Capen of the University of Buffalo, and Dr. Frederick J. Kelly of the U. S. Office of Education, decided to have one main division of universities not differentiated as to complexity or size, but simply on the basis of public control and private control.

As the proposal regarding independent schools of theology, medicine, law, pharmacy, music, etc., met with general approval at Cincinnati, these schools were included in the form which the committee voted to send out to presidents of all types of institutions through the office of the Association of American Colleges.

*Technological*

1. Under Public Control  
*e.g.* Iowa State College, Michigan State, Purdue, etc.
2. Under Private Control  
*e.g.* California Inst. of Technology, M.I.T., Stevens (Men), etc.

*Teaching*

1. Under Public Control  
*e.g.* Colorado State Teachers College, etc.
2. Under Private Control  
*e.g.* George Peabody College for Teachers, etc.

*Theology* (?)

- Under Private Control  
*e.g.* Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Union Theological Seminary, etc.

*Medicine* (?)

- Under Private Control  
*e.g.* Jefferson Medical College

*Law* (?)

- Under Private Control  
*e.g.* Detroit College of Law, New Jersey Law School, etc.

*Pharmacy* (?)

- e.g.* Philadelphia College of Pharmacy

*Music* (?)

- e.g.* New England Conservatory of Music

*Specialized* (?)

- Under Private Control
1. *e.g.* Simmons, Skidmore, etc.
  2. *e.g.* Springfield Y. M. C. A. College, etc.
  3. *e.g.* Pratt Institute, etc.

IV. JUNIOR COLLEGES (Coeducational unless otherwise indicated)

Under Public Control

1. *e.g.* Pasadena Junior College, etc.

Under Private Control

2. *e.g.* Bradford Academy, etc.

Heading No. 1 is Universities. You will agree, I think, that there is no need here to define a university, or to debate the ideas of a university with which books, magazines and newspapers have recently abounded.

You will observe that, as possibly the neatest way to differentiate, I have noted in parentheses in Sections I, III and IV that the institutions thereunder listed are coeducational unless otherwise indicated. You of the Middle West and West and

perhaps the South already know this; but it will come as a surprise to most Eastern educators that there are nearly five times as many men enrolled in coeducational institutions as in men's colleges, and more than five times as many women in coeducational institutions as in separate colleges for women.

I have divided the universities into two groups.\* One group comprises institutions of complex organization having a graduate school (and here is meant a school in which a rather large number of candidates are in resident study for the doctorate), having certain professional schools (usually including law, medicine, education and sometimes theology and technical schools), and also having an undergraduate college leading to the bachelor's degree. For comparison with independent institutions the enrolment of the various schools of the university—particularly the undergraduate college, for our Association's purposes—should be individually recorded. Also for coordinate women's colleges. Separate statistics can hardly be given for their library, scientific apparatus, grounds, buildings and endowments, as all are ordinarily merged in the university totals.

The same plan would hold for the second group of universities. These are universities of somewhat less complex organization, having certain graduate courses (usually not so varied or so largely attended by resident students for the doctorate), having professional or technological schools, and having an undergraduate college. The names on the sheet show universities of high rank in various geographical sections which are examples of this group. Instead of grouping on a basis of complexity of organization, it may be advisable to group universities on a basis of size, *e. g.*, universities having 3,000 enrolment or over, and universities under 3,000.

The institutions throughout Sections I, III, and IV are divided into those under public control and those under private control; the former including state and municipal institutions, the latter institutions under self-perpetuating or elective boards of trustees, both non-denominational and denominational. The advantages of such classification for comparisons are obvious.

In Division II, Colleges of Arts and Science, nearly all are under private control, non-denominational and denominational. It has not seemed to me wise to divide the colleges on a denominational basis. My reason is this:



Many colleges which are church-related receive very small appropriations from their churches. Many others, although they receive no church funds and have no legal relationship, are in truth close to the religious thinking of some particular denomination. It seems to me that no classification based on the literal facts as to church relationship would truly represent the actual situation.

Because so many of the colleges in the East are separate institutions for men and for women it appears advantageous in this division to list them separately, following the coeducational colleges. Statistics on these bases should furnish a useful fund of information. They may then be compared as to enrolment of students and possibly also as to numbers of teachers in the undergraduate colleges of the universities.

The third division, Technological-Professional Institutions, includes those colleges and schools of independent foundation which are conducted apart from university connection.

This list starts with the technological institutions which began to flourish in the United States immediately after the Civil War. The public institutions to be listed here are chiefly the Land-grant colleges of the several states which owe their origin to the Morrill Act of 1862 with its leading object "to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts." Institutions under private control are those ranging from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, founded in 1865, to the California Institute of Technology which began work on its present campus in 1910. The second group under this division are the teachers colleges and the four-year normal schools, a group which a university registrar writes me, "has grown to such an extent that it is entitled to a separate classification." Another correspondent, however, expresses "special gratification in having teaching institutions placed in the technological-professional group."

I have placed question marks after theology, law, and specialized schools, which are independent of universities and should welcome opinions from this audience regarding the inclusion of these groups. Should I add also headings for independent schools of medicine, such as the Jefferson Medical College; of pharmacy, such as the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy; of music, such as the New England Conservatory of Music?

We are not now attempting to decide upon the specific placing of universities and colleges and independent professional institutions within the proposed classification. That will come later. My thought would be to ask the president of each institution to indicate his own selection of institutional position and decisions in doubtful cases could be made by some authoritative committee.

Our present concern is with the adoption of a general classification. I should be grateful if those in the audience who have suggestions to make would write them out and let me have them sometime before this evening, filing your written memoranda with Dr. Kelly or Mr. Palmer. I should be happy to talk over the classification with any who are interested.

And now, Mr. President, I move that this proposed classification of institutions of higher education be referred to Dr. Cowling's Committee for revisions and for a report to this Association at the business session tomorrow morning.

---

We have no suggestions to offer regarding the service made available by the Association, but I should like to offer you my congratulations upon the useful investigation in the matter of Comprehensive Examinations, in which I was greatly interested. I attended the luncheon conference given by Dr. Jones on the subject at Cincinnati and I am looking forward with keen interest to the publication of the whole report regarding this matter.—*A University Dean.*

I think you are doing a very excellent piece of service for all the colleges through the BULLETIN and through *Christian Education*. I have not felt at all like suggesting extra responsibilities, for I know what the limitations of time and money exact from administrators. I am very happy and well pleased with the service which the Association and Executives are rendering.—*A College President.*

I want to tell you how valuable a feature I think "Some Progressive College Projects" in your last BULLETIN is. The succinctness, definiteness, and clarity of those statements make them very valuable—more worth while, perhaps, than many a conference which all of us attend at one time or another.—*A University Dean.*

I have no suggestions to make along this line beyond seeking the continuance of the constructive criticism that you have been offering, but we do want to take the opportunity to say to you that the service which you have already rendered to X— has been of greater value than I suspect you quite understand.—*A College President.*

## ATHLETICS AND THE CHARACTER-BUILDING FUNCTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

### Report of the Commission on College Athletics

THOMAS S. GATES

PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THERE have been few phases of collegiate education more discussed in the past few years than athletics. In that discussion the University of Pennsylvania has had its full share, and I have the feeling that my voice has been heard on the subject so frequently that there is very little new that I could say to you here today. It is my belief that mere discussion of collegiate athletics has for the moment gone far enough and that the next steps of progress lie in the direction of action—immediate, decisive, and courageous action to put into effect those principles at our colleges and universities which have generally been agreed upon as beneficial for our programs of athletics, physical education and student health.

Your Commission on College Athletics, of which you did me the honor of appointing me Chairman, has lodged with the Secretary a preliminary report at this time. Were I to continue to add to the discussion of college athletics indefinitely I fear that there would be serious danger that I should become known as a sort of sporting parson among the heads of colleges and universities. I believe we can over-emphasize athletics even by discussing them too much. Permit me, however, to summarize briefly our report, without reading it all to you.

It has seemed to us that our Commission may define its task as embracing four general functions or objectives: first, to confer, comparing our thoughts and experiences, exchanging ideas, and giving public expression and continual re-expression to principles which thus far seem in the right direction; second, to suggest for immediate adoption by all institutions proposals and definite plans worth trying; third, to provide leadership in our own institutions, so far as we may, for the specific proposals suggested and for others aiming at the betterment of collegiate athletics; and fourth, earnestly to hope that institutions will put into practice those policies which have been generally approved

by educators in their effort to think constructively upon the problems which have grown out of the tremendous public and alumni interest in intercollegiate athletics.

It would have served no purpose for us to have made any extensive survey of athletic thought and practice throughout the country at this time, since the Carnegie Foundation in its fourth report dated in 1931 has gone exhaustively into the various phases of the problems of intercollegiate athletics. What we do believe is important is a re-statement of certain principles which represent a fair cross-section of the best thought upon these problems so far as that thought has been crystalized to date. It seems to us that many thoughtful persons have at least approached an agreement on certain points. If these conclusions are sound, then our next step of progress is obviously to persuade as many institutions as possible to administer their programs of physical education in accordance with these principles. Our immediate objective, therefore, is to give emphasis, again and again to those ideas which if generally tried by the colleges and universities of the country within the next two years would, we believe, bring about substantial accomplishment within that period. Our doctors have told us what the medicine is; it is now our duty to try it for a reasonable period to see whether it indeed effects a cure.

Briefly stated, our report suggests that the following twelve points are essentials of a program and policy which would be in accord with the most sincere thought on the subject of physical education in college life to meet modern conditions.

1. The trustees, the officers, and especially the president of a college or university are responsible for the type of athletics and physical education that an institution has.
2. Athletics and physical education should be coordinated administratively, and in detailed functioning, with student health services, preferably under a single directing head.
3. A program of physical education and athletics should be operated for the benefit of all students and not merely for those proficient enough to win positions on teams engaging in intercollegiate competition.
4. Responsibility for the physical welfare of athletes rests with the college or university health service both as to qualifica-

tions for participation and as to continuance in any contest, whether intramural or intercollegiate.

5. When athletics cease to be fun and become drudgery, there is something wrong with the system.

6. Not only subsidizing, but also recruiting and proselyting of athletes, as defined by the Carnegie report, are contrary to the amateur system which should prevail in college athletics. Most of our institutions need more funds for scholarships and loans to students. Such aid should be distributed impartially upon the basis of need, ability, and promise, and should be neither given nor withheld because of athletic accomplishment.

7. Full publicity should be given to all that our colleges and universities do in athletics, for the willingness to have full publicity is a test of honesty.

8. The shortening of the football season to six or seven games for the first team, with the elimination of pre-season practice is a desirable development which will do much to place football more nearly in its proper relationship to the whole program of physical education and the educational process. All sports events should be studied for effects on health, which might lead to shortening of crew races and elimination of the longer track events.

9. The elimination from our schedules of all but natural rivals—teams from those institutions not too far distant and approximately of the same size, whose codes of academic and athletic work are approximately on a parity—should soon develop an aristocracy of sportsmanship, thus setting up a class distinction which will make it desirable for institutions to conform as soon as possible to standards which are, in the public mind, identified with the highest type of sportsmanship and amateurism. The guiding principle should be intercollegiate athletics between teams of approximately equal physical and mental powers and similar ideals.

10. There is a growing belief that coaches should be of faculty caliber, of faculty rank, paid in accordance with the general scale of faculty salaries. It seems clear to us that a coach has his largest opportunities in the direction of character-building, and if a choice has to be made between proficiency in training winning teams and personality inspiring to youth, the balance of weight in the decision should lie wholly in the latter direction.

11. The actual control of the playing of games must be returned more and more to the students. (At least one member of the Commission goes so far as to believe that coaches should teach only during practice periods, leaving to players—and physicians—the responsibilities of substitutions, and to players alone the determination of strategy during contests.)

12. Finally, we believe that the colleges and universities have a considerable task to perform in the education of their constituencies as to what constitutes real merit in an institution's physical education system. If we can educate our alumni and the public to have respect and admiration for an institution which lays greater store by a well-developed program of athletics for all than by a lop-sided development of one sport, and for teams which are honest though they may not be able to win more than half the time, so called over-emphasis will have become only a growing pain of the past.

There are certain studies which we should like to call to your attention as deserving consideration. To some of them we shall give our thought during the coming year.

In the first place, what can we do to expedite the general acceptance of athletic practices which have already come to attention as being theoretically sound? Do we need leagues through which teams should be formally outlawed which do not conform to the principles according to which some of us wish to play, or can we, by means of the same gentlemanly arrangements through which we select our friends, accomplish the same end?

Is there a possibility that through informal treaties we may bring about athletic disarmament among a certain number of institutions which can set the pace for the country? Such agreements could cover such matters as eligibility, amateur standards, the shortening of the football season, the elimination of training houses, the elimination of pre-season practice, positive measures for equalizing the physical powers of competitors (as is already done in boxing, wrestling, horse racing, and notably in yachting), or other matters which seemed to a particular group of colleges mutually beneficial.

The control of aid and scholarships given to students is also a problem for further study. Where motives are so difficult to



judge and confidential arrangements so difficult to scrutinize, it is not easy for even the most conscientious institution to be aware, for example, of all that goes on between the alumnus and the student, even though within our walls we place under strict supervision the award of scholarships, loan funds, student employment, and other aid.

One of the most important developments for the future must be consideration of the means by which we may give to our students an interest and a proficiency in games which they may continue in the years after graduation. I have no doubt that if we were to send a questionnaire to a large and representative body of college and university alumni, we should find that many of them would advise us that it is fully as important, from their points of view, that we should have facilities for golf, tennis, squash, and handball, as for football. Moreover, it seems to us that the time may be propitious for us to look again into the objectives of physical training so that we may plan our programs with an eye to what we are trying to accomplish in the physical development of the student and how such objectives are best to be attained. If we were to approach the problem in this manner, we should wish to consult our medical authorities for advice as to the habits of exercise best in youth for one who in a few years is to be an adult leading a different kind of life from that of student days.

We have made real progress in the past few years in bettering our systems of athletics, sport, and physical education. We shall have to permit the processes of evolution to take us for a little distance along these new paths, but it must be a directed evolution. We must maintain an eternal vigilance lest we slip back.

We must persuade ourselves that athletics play only a part in a college or university—albeit an important part. We must place athletics in their proper relationship to all that we are attempting to do in fitting young men and women for the many-sided responsibilities, opportunities, and pleasures of life.

My own interest in college athletics, keen as it is, is not based so much upon the admittedly intrinsic interest of the subject itself, as upon the importance of the part that athletics rightfully play in the education of youth. I take it that the function of a college is threefold: the development of character, physical

well-being, and intellect. In all three of these objectives, athletics play a part—a primary part in the second, a very important part in the first, and certainly at least some part in the third.

It was because of the strong character-building potentialities of games and sport that many of us have felt it profitable to change our athletic policies, to have coaches of faculty caliber and rank, to give athletic contests and intercollegiate games back to the students, and to place the responsibility for this agency in our educational program where it belongs—under the authority of the Board of Trustees and the president.

Athletics are but one link in the chain. It happened to be a weak link at the time that at Pennsylvania we gave it intensive study and applied corrective measures looking to a betterment of the system. It was a weak link nationally as well. Such forging as we did of this link of the chain we did at that time because the iron was hot, and not because athletics were our primary interest. We must patiently and hopefully await the result.

The time has now come for us at Pennsylvania, at least, to look to the strength of some of the other links of the chain. And it is to two of these other component responsibilities of the task we are trying to do that I should like to refer briefly to-day. I have said that the responsibility for physical education and athletics at a college rests directly upon the administrative head. I believe, in all sincerity, that another important, perhaps the most important, character-building agency of our civilization, namely, the spiritual development of our students, is equally the responsibility of the university and its administrative heads. This is at present, I fear, a link in our chain which sorely needs mending.

The fundamental purpose of the early colleges in this country was the training of men for the ministry. Certainly then and as they developed later, our early colleges took it as their purpose to combine learning with spirituality and religion. With the growth of the movement in the direction of making our educational institutions non-sectarian and the trend toward liberality of thinking, there was necessarily a spiritual loss involved. We seem now to have come to the point where educational institutions, located in metropolitan districts where prob-

lems are complicated and campus life less significant, in effect, disavow responsibility for the religious instruction of their students. That task they are content to leave to the family or the church, or to outside agencies to struggle with as best they can.

But in that disavowal I think we are merely rationalizing after the fact. In my opinion when two million parents of American youth entrust to us one million of their sons and daughters, they are placing upon us a very grave responsibility. We are, for four years, to occupy the place of the father of these boys and girls. I do not believe that their real parents in turning over this grave trust say to us "Take our sons and our daughters. Give them an education which will consist of the amassing of a certain body of worldly knowledge and an ability to think. We hold you to no accountability for their spiritual welfare." I do not believe that. I believe that this side of the training of the student is definitely a part of our responsibility. Further than that I believe that at the present time some of us are doing very little about it. I do not believe that we can leave this task to the churches or to other agencies off the campus, no matter how earnest and sincere their work may be. It is definitely a part of the task that we should directly undertake in training the student for life, and I for one propose that the University over which I have the honor to preside should look toward some constructive steps in the direction of this opportunity for improving the work we are attempting to do.

Many of you men who have the responsibility of leadership of campuses in detached locations or campuses benefiting from denominational inspiration have had to grapple with this question and have met it successfully. We in the larger areas with the complications of congested life and with campuses of varying groups would do well to learn what we can from your example. There is a road back to first principles which you have pursued and from which perhaps we have deviated. That road, I believe, we should follow. It is the definite responsibility of the large university, despite the magnitude of the problem, at least to do its very best to emphasize the spiritual values. What type of young man and young woman can we send forth into the world who lacks this background? How can we supply that framework of character better than by ourselves emphasizing in every possible way our faith and belief in its value?

By inaction before such a problem the wrong impression goes abroad. By action at least emphasis can be placed where emphasis is due with the possibility of weaving into the growing youth the finer things of life which are really worth while and significant. For some of us in these larger fields perhaps the way is easy; for some, more difficult. But we could do no less, in my judgment, than to make this the keynote of the type of education we offer by having upon our staff a personality devoting his entire time to the spiritual interests of students just as we have educators devoting time to their intellectual development. If college life means anything to young men or young women, it should mean that they leave its training stronger in spiritual values, regardless of their denominational adherence where they have one and supplied with such a relationship if they have not. In no other way can we fully train better engineers or doctors or lawyers or business men or teachers than to make them better servants of their fellow men, and to be better servants they must understand the significance of worship and have developed within their souls a higher feeling for the verities of life.

One may well wonder in these changing times whether part of the difficulty under which the world is laboring is not attributable to a lessening in the appreciation of the values which our forefathers taught us were really important. If it is our belief that, when we place the stamp of a liberal education upon our product, we should include in the requirement for that stamp some appreciation of the fine arts, of music, of literature, and of history, then it seems to me entirely illogical that we should be content to turn forth students blind on the even more eternal values of piety and faith and thus deprive these men and women of the satisfaction and the pleasure which will come to them from a solid philosophy grounded in definite beliefs and a vigorous sense of moral values.

The other link in the educational chain to which I have referred and which, as a newcomer in the field of education, challenges my attention is that which has to do with the scope of education and its objective. I confess that a study of a catalogue of a great university bewilders me and makes me wonder whether we have not attempted too much. The fundamental streams of education have been divided and re-divided, and the average student has little opportunity amid the great mass of subjects offered

to learn any one thing well. He catches but a glimmering of the truth filtered through many different windows, and I wonder whether, after the four years are over, his mind has gained more than a moving picture of the realm of knowledge which he has had the opportunity to survey.

I am in deep water here, and you men who have given your lives to the study of education may well treat what I have to say lightly. But if the reflection of one who has come but recently from the outside and who has had the opportunity for a year or two to look back of the scenes is worth while, then may I say I have a sincere doubt upon this point and I express it frankly for what it is worth.

I know of course that the realm of knowledge is ever widening; yet the fundamentals which the well-rounded man needs to enlighten his life and make him a happy and useful citizen can never seriously change. The special student who reads for honors or trains for teaching or dedicates his life to research must delve into special fields and the greatest latitude is open to him and wisely open in an ever-widening degree. But four years is a short time to mold character and for the average student perhaps we would do well to think of accentuating the fundamentals of education and leave off the vast side issues which possibly only blur the vision. If college life but stimulates you to further mental activity along well directed lines, may it not have accomplished its purpose?

There is a comparison with business perhaps in all this. During the decade which has just passed, how truly we now see some of the mistakes which have been made—how capital was over-invested and companies infinitely created and money expended here and there for production which we now know has not been justified or profitable. In a national sense our retrenchment is a hopeful sign because it brings the great field of business back again to its feet on more solid ground. Perhaps during these recent years education has gone somewhat the same way. Perhaps we would better have strengthened our colleges within our universities and built up our curricula upon sound, well-established lines leaving for the advanced scholar or man of research the opportunity to delve as far as he might wish into other fields which need not necessarily become part of an established curriculum.

If the purpose of education is still conceived to be, in the words of Herbert Spencer, "How to use our faculties to the greatest advantage of ourselves and others—how to live completely"—if this is the great thing that education has to teach, if the only rational mode of judging an educational course is to judge in what degree it discharges this function, then perhaps education would do well to re-examine its processes to see whether it too has not over-expanded, not in the number of young men and young women who are to be educated, not in its research and highly specialized work which has to do with increasing the sum of human knowledge, but rather in the curriculum which it offers to the average student who might perhaps better travel through four years of fundamental teaching upon lines which have been well established than to hurry through a maze of courses offering parts of subjects which leave the mind only bewildered and at sea.

Based upon these considerations, I look upon the future of our great educational institutions with renewed interest and enthusiasm. With diminished incomes, they are afforded the glorious opportunity of re-examination and re-adjustment, and I honestly believe that this re-adjustment will lead toward a more normal curriculum and a sincere effort to do the task which they have set out to do more constructively and more helpfully. We, too, will have the inescapable opportunity to distinguish the unessentials and if the result of our self-examination is to re-introduce, with our enforced economies, simplicity and earnestness in education, which perhaps in a sense we have somewhat lost, then our efforts will indeed not have been wholly in vain.

Perhaps you may feel that I have departed from my assigned subject. If I have, it is only because I believe it is impossible to treat athletics at college as an isolated subject. A consideration of all of these matters upon which I have briefly touched is necessary for a properly oriented vision of what all of us are attempting to do. My interest is in the individual student. If we are to train him broadly—physically, intellectually, and spiritually—we must look at our whole program and test it by its effectiveness in accomplishing our objectives in all three of these directions.



## THE SECTIONAL LUNCHEON CONFERENCES

FOR the first time, the Association program of 1932 included a series of seven informal luncheon conferences following the last general session of the Annual Meeting, Friday, January 22. The topics and leaders of discussion were as follows: "Credits and Credit Systems," President William M. Lewis, Lafayette College; "Objective Indices of Faculty Scholarship Obtainable through the Library," President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College; "Faculty-Student Relationships," Dean Christian Gauss, Princeton University, and President Katharine Blunt, Connecticut College for Women; "Individualization in Teaching," President Homer P. Rainey, Bucknell University; "The Comprehensive Examination," Dr. Edward S. Jones, Director of Special Study; "Standard Financial Reports," Mr. J. C. Christensen, Assistant Secretary and Purchasing Agent, University of Michigan; "Financial and Fiduciary Matters," Dr. Alfred W. Anthony, New York.

Brief reports furnished by the chairmen follow. It is planned to publish the specially prepared papers in the May issue.

### CREDITS AND CREDIT SYSTEMS

The Conference on "Credits and Credit Systems" was well attended and was marked by vigorous discussion. The Chairman, President Lewis, of Lafayette College, in opening the conference stressed the importance of thinking in terms of individual development, rather than in those of credits and years, and diplomas. He read a number of letters from college presidents, to whom he had submitted the conference subject under discussion and who presented constructive ideas concerning the promotion of real scholarship. He then called upon Dr. C. R. Mann, of the American Council on Education, to lead the discussion. Dr. Mann dwelt on the matter of stimulating and measuring student achievement. He called attention to the policy of industrial concerns who in times of depression dropped men first whose reliability is not of a high order, suggesting that a similar test could effectively be applied to college students. In the ensuing discussion it was made evident that there is a

general desire for a constantly greater trend toward quality standards rather than quantity standards in education. The lack of completely satisfactory methods of measuring achievement was also repeatedly pointed out. Members of the conference agreed that sharp attention should be given to working out such systems of measurement, and in throwing increasing stress on the creation of interest in intellectual pursuits by taking the emphasis off the adding machine method of ascertaining a student's standing and progress.

#### OBJECTIVE INDICES OF FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP OBTAINABLE THROUGH THE LIBRARY

The sectional luncheon conference on "Objective Indices of Faculty Scholarship Obtainable through the Library" was held in Room B of the Netherland Plaza Hotel, with sixteen persons present.

President Henry W. Wriston, of Lawrence College, opened the conference by reading a formal paper outlining a study which had been undertaken along this line. Members of the staff were classified in accordance with the number of books they withdrew from the library, the range of library classifications in which they manifested an interest in drawing books, the nature of the books taken for use outside the library, and purchases from two special funds. The data thus gathered were completed with a classification of each member of the faculty made by his colleagues on the basis of their opinion. The correspondence between the two bases, objective and subjective, proved to be very high.

The matter was discussed by President Raymond A. Kent, University of Louisville; Mr. George S. Dalgety, of Northwestern University; Mr. Robert Lester, of the Carnegie Corporation; Dean John R. Effinger, of the University of Michigan; Mrs. H. E. Watters, Georgetown College; President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College, and others.

#### STUDENT-FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS

The sectional luncheon conference on "Student-Faculty Relationships" was held in room G of the Netherland Plaza Hotel, with forty-six persons in attendance.

Dr. Katharine Blunt, President of Connecticut College, called the meeting to order at 1:15. Dean Gauss then read a formal paper. President Blunt followed with an address that emphasized the personality of the instructor, the natural intimacy engendered by small classes, departmental clubs, assistantships, social affairs; respect for and confidence in the student.

There was a long and lively discussion of the topic in which the following took part: President Blackwell, of Randolph-Macon College for Men; President Haas, of Muhlenberg College; Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, of the Institute of International Education; Dean Raymond Walters, of Swarthmore College; President Burgstahler, of Cornell College (Iowa); President Bowers, of Kansas Wesleyan; Professor Lipscomb, of Randolph-Macon College for Women; Professor Crowley, of Ohio State University; Dr. Deane, of Fordham University, and others.

#### INDIVIDUALIZATION IN TEACHING

The luncheon conference on "Individualization in Teaching" was held in parlor C of the Netherland Plaza Hotel. After the chairman had explained the purpose of the meeting and suggested that the discussion be very informal, he ably struck the keynote as summed up in the following words:

That education had arrived at a period of "sympathetically guided individualism" where the needs of the individual students, which are very different, had arrested the attention of higher education with the result that a number of experiments in the individualization of teaching were taking place.

In order to start the discussion, President Rainey explained the experiment in individual instruction which he began two years ago when president of Franklin College. In this plan a small group of carefully selected students were at the end of the sophomore year taken from the regular classes and given individually arranged curricula for the junior and senior years. Students thus selected were not forced to attend classes but did their work individually under the direction of a chosen professor. At the end of the two-year period a comprehensive examination was given the student to determine his qualifications for a degree. In the course of the discussion which followed, President Rainey pointed out that these students had been se-

lected at the end of the sophomore year because the student needed to have a strong intellectual interest and as a general rule freshmen and sophomores did not possess this interest, and that the students needed to be chosen on their ability to do independent work under careful guidance. It was noted that education was a life process and not one of four years and that something needed to be done to eliminate from the student's mind the conception of education in terms of systems, units, or other symbols.

The discussion then converged about the preparation of the teacher and the teaching load. It was generally agreed that the teacher needed to be exceptionally well prepared for any program of individualization in teaching and that a new conception of the teaching load would be necessary in a plan of this sort. The danger of the emphasis on research in undergraduate instruction was also called to attention. The consensus of opinion was that this plan, in getting away from set courses and making it possible to cut across department lines, was a step forward in individualization in teaching.

The suggestion of Dr. Cottrell, of Teachers College, that the small group and conference method was a form of individualized teaching led President Warren, of Sarah Lawrence College, to explain the plan of that institution. Briefly, she reported that the program at Sarah Lawrence was an individual one with no required courses, but with each student taking three major subjects and an activity. The student made her selection with the help of a faculty advisor, the idea being to develop each student to the best living possible for that individual.

In the discussions that followed some of the questions which arose were: Is it socially dangerous to let students specialize? How far can we go in individualization? How much class socialization is needed? Should there be a more careful study made of prerequisite courses and what is their importance?

It was brought out that there are at least three types of teaching and individualization: the informal teaching and class procedure, group discussions and conferences, and personal teaching. At this point Dean Anderson explained briefly some of the steps which Rollins College had taken to break down the barrier between the instructor and the student by means of its confer-

ence plan where the classes were no larger than twenty in size, the class period was two hours in length, and the courses concentrated into term units, each class meeting five times a week. Under this plan class conferences, small group conferences, and personal conferences were used. He also spoke briefly concerning the individualized curriculum which had been inaugurated recently at Rollins in addition to the conference plan.

The discussion then revolved about the topic of teaching as related to individualization. The tutorial method was given consideration. Several of those in attendance told of special techniques of individual instructors of their acquaintance. Notice was made of the various experiments in individualization which are going on at Swarthmore, Franklin, Rollins, Reed, Sarah Lawrence, and other colleges. In the discussions it was generally agreed that some points upon which individualization depended were as follows:

An individual technique in the classroom with less teaching and more learning.

A decrease in the teaching load, both with a smaller number of students and less class periods for the instructor and with a smaller number of classes for the student.

That mastery of the subject needed to be substituted for the time concept and that students needed to learn how to study.

It was generally agreed that the intellectual curiosity and interest of the student needed to be aroused and that this called for the exceptional teacher.

Those in attendance at the meeting, with the colleges they represented, are as follows: President Homer P. Rainey, Bucknell University; President Constance Warren, Sarah Lawrence College; Professor Minnie Vautrin, Ginling College (Nanking, China); President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College; President A. H. Upham, Miami University; President Charles A. Anderson, Tusculum College; President Ralph Waldo Lloyd, Maryville College; Personnel Director Max B. Robinson, Cincinnati Milling Machine Company; President Earl E. Harper, Evansville College; Dean Frank C. Foster, Tusculum College; Dr. Gould Wickey, Executive Secretary, Board of Education, United Lutheran Church in America; Professor Donald P. Cottrell,

Teachers College; Dean Winslow S. Anderson, Rollins College; President Robert C. Clothier, Rutgers University; Dean Homer L. Dodge, University of Oklahoma.

Following a general agreement that the progress being made in individualization in education was a step in the right direction, the conference adjourned, *sine die*, at 2:30 P. M.

#### THE COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION

About fifty members of the Association met from 12:30 to nearly 3:30, to discuss various systems and problems of final examination. The chairman outlined the several distinctive forms now in operation in colleges of the northeast section of the country.

The main features of their forms are as follows:

(a) Extension of "Special Honors" programs for the abler students, to include end major examining.

(b) General examining in the major field required of all A.B. candidates.

(c) Divisional examining, based on conferences, with reduced course attendance (Harvard program).

(d) Examining in three related fields, based on seminars, with external examiners for honors students in written and oral tests (Swarthmore program).

(e) Examining in a wide range of required subject matter fields, as well as a special field examination.

Various combinations of these features were being tried also. Dean Eisenhart discussed the Princeton system which includes with major examining a senior thesis—based on conferences—as a part of the final grade determining "honors."

President Macmillan, of Wells College, explained the essential feature of a final comprehensive examination, in his estimation, as contrasted with typical course examinations. While the latter were to test knowledge of detailed information and should be assumed as a matter of course, the "comprehensive" is primarily to test how well the candidate can use elements of information to solve a new situation or problem.

The success of the comprehensive examination as a vitalizing influence in colleges is contingent upon its ability to motivate students to consider real and total situations, and not text-book



summaries and petty course details. Discussion centered about type of questions, and methods of preparing for such examinations, such as the individual conference, the seminar and the coordinating end course.

#### STANDARD FINANCIAL REPORTS

The luncheon meeting on "Standard Financial Reports" was in charge of the National Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Education. In the absence of Lloyd Morey, Chairman, who was unavoidably detained, Mr. J. C. Christensen, of the University of Michigan, presided. Mr. Christensen outlined the history and purposes of the Committee and its progress to date. He then reviewed the recommendations of the Committee as presented in its published report of July, 1931, entitled *Suggested Forms for Financial Reports of Colleges and Universities*.

This eighty page volume contains forms as suggested by the Committee for the annual financial reports of colleges and universities. It also contains a complete description and explanation of all of the items entering into these reports and illustrative forms. While the volume is not a manual of accounts, it contains many valuable comments on accounting and reporting procedure. It is the hope of the Committee that its recommendations may be adopted in substance by colleges and universities generally. Many institutions have done this already.

The discussion which followed was participated in by many persons present including Presidents D. J. Cowling and G. F. Zook, both of whom are members of the Committee. Dr. F. J. Kelly and Mr. E. M. Foster, of the U. S. Office of Education, expressed the desire of that office to cooperate with the Committee and to follow its suggestions as far and as rapidly as practicable. Dr. Kelly stated that in his opinion the progress of the Committee represents "a most important and splendid advancement in institutional accounting."

There was wide-spread interest in the proposals of the Committee and an indication of the desire on the part of college representatives present to fall in line with its recommendations. This fact is further illustrated by the action of the Lutheran, Congregational, and Disciples Boards of Education in voting to

adopt the recommendations of the Committee in principle and in recommending their use to their colleges. The Methodist Episcopal Board of Education has compiled its report for the coming year in harmony with the proposals of the Committee.

A bulletin of the Committee published January, 1932, presents the statements of Carleton College, a small endowed institution, and those of the State University of Iowa, a large public university, in comparative form as an illustration of the possibilities of the Committee proposals.

#### FINANCIAL AND FIDUCIARY MATTERS

Twenty people sat at lunch on Friday, January 23rd, to consider problems in the field of endowments and trust funds, under the chairmanship of Alfred Williams Anthony, with the assistance of Daniel S. Remsen.

The colleges represented are in Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Arkansas, Iowa, Ohio, Washington, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, North Carolina, Georgia and Nebraska.

The subjects dealt with chiefly centered around the investment of funds, cooperation with banks and trust companies, the value of annuity agreements and methods of handling annuity funds, approaches to persons of large wealth, and the exact designation and definition of various types of endowments. The session as a whole continued from 12:30 to 4:00 o'clock, and individuals protracted their interviews until nearly 6:00 o'clock. The profitableness of friendly conference concerning important and perplexing problems was clearly vindicated.

---

#### COMMUNITY CHESTS

The National Association of Community Chests and Councils, as reported in the New York Times of January 3, 1932, states that 206 community campaigns already completed have raised \$67,865,808, compared with their aggregate goals of \$67,102,223, or 101.1% of the sums aimed at. \$82,000,000 was raised by the community chests in 1931. The total of \$67,865,808 from 206 campaigns indicates, as estimated by the Association, that the remaining 185 cities which have not yet completed their campaigns, will bring the total of money raised for 1931 up to more than \$100,000,000.

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING  
OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES  
JANUARY 21-22, 1932

NETHERLAND PLAZA, CINCINNATI, OHIO

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21

*First Session*

THE Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges was called to order by the President of the Association, President Ernest H. Wilkins, of Oberlin College, in the Hall of Mirrors of the Netherland Plaza, Cincinnati, Ohio, on Thursday morning, January 21, 1932, at ten o'clock.

President Irving Maurer, of Beloit College, offered the invocation.

The President announced the appointment of the following committees:

*Committee on Resolutions:* President Edmund D. Soper, Ohio Wesleyan University, Chairman, President Katharine Blunt, Connecticut College, President Clifton D. Gray, Bates College, President Albert Britt, Knox College, and President T. W. Nadal, Drury College.

*Committee on Nominations:* President W. G. Clippinger, Otterbein College, Chairman, Sister Antonia, College of St. Catherine, President James R. McCain, Agnes Scott College, Dean W. H. Wannamaker, Duke University, and Dean W. W. Hewett, University of Cincinnati.

*Committee on Conference with the Liberal Arts College Movement:* President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University, President D. J. Cowling, Carleton College, Dean C. S. Boucher, University of Chicago, President Murray Bartlett, Hobart College, and President William C. Dennis, Earlham College.

The annual report of the Executive Committee and the Executive Secretary was presented by the Executive Secretary, Dr. Robert L. Kelly. It was

*Voted,* That the report of the Executive Committee and the Executive Secretary be received and that the items in that report requiring action be adopted.

This action included (1) the adoption of the tentative budget as presented subject to such modification as the incoming Executive Committee may see fit to make, and (2) the admission of the following colleges to membership in the Association:

Albertus Magnus College, New Haven, Connecticut  
 Augustana College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota  
 Austin College, Sherman, Texas  
 Bishop College, Marshall, Texas  
 Clarkson College, Potsdam, New York  
 Colleges of the City of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan  
 College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St. Joseph, Ohio  
 College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Arkansas  
 College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, Minnesota  
 Georgia State Woman's College, Valdosta, Georgia  
 Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tennessee  
 Loyola College, Baltimore, Maryland  
 Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Virginia  
 Maryville College, St. Louis, Missouri  
 Moravian College for Women, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania  
 North Carolina College for Negroes, Durham, North Carolina  
 Notre Dame College, South Euclid, Ohio  
 St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa  
 St. Vincent College, Latrobe, Pennsylvania  
 Talladega College, Talladega, Alabama  
 Union College, Barbourville, Kentucky  
 University of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan  
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia  
 Ursuline College, Cleveland, Ohio  
 Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Pennsylvania  
 Willamette University, Salem, Oregon

The annual report of the Treasurer was presented by the Treasurer of the Association, President William Mather Lewis, of Lafayette College. It was

*Voted*, That the annual report of the Treasurer be accepted and be placed on file.

The report of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers was presented by the chairman of that Commission, President James L. McConaughy, of Wesleyan University. It was

*Voted*, That the report of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers be accepted, and it was further

*Voted*, That the recommendation contained in that report be referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

The report of the Commission on Educational Surveys was presented by the chairman of that Commission, President Frank L. McVey, of the University of Kentucky. It was

*Voted*, That the report of the Commission on Educational Surveys be accepted and be placed on file.

The report of the Committee on the Proposed Form of Classification of Institutions of Higher Education was presented by Dean Raymond Walters, of Swarthmore College. It was

*Voted*, That the report of the Committee on the Proposed Form of Classification of Institutions of Higher Education be accepted, and it was further

*Voted*, That the recommendation contained in that report be referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

A progress report of the National Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Learning was submitted by the chairman of that Committee, President Donald J. Cowling, of Carleton College, with the announcement that the report would be the substance of one of the luncheon conferences the following day.

The report of the Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds was presented by the chairman of that Commission, Dr. Alfred Williams Anthony. It was

*Voted*, That the report of the Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds be accepted, and be placed on file.

The report of the Commission on College Athletics was presented by the chairman of that Commission, President Thomas S. Gates, of the University of Pennsylvania. It was

*Voted*, That the report of the Commission on College Athletics be accepted and placed on file.

The meeting adjourned at 12: 15 o'clock.

### *Second Session*

The second session of the meeting, held in the Hall of Mirrors of the Netherland Plaza, was called to order by President Wilkins at 2: 45 o'clock Thursday afternoon, January 21.

In his presidential address, President Wilkins discussed "Society and the College."

Mr. Walter H. Siple, Director of the Cincinnati Art Museum, spoke on "What an Art Museum Can Do to Cooperate with the College and University."

The following report of the Committee on Conference with the Liberal Arts College Movement was presented by the chairman of that Committee, President James L. McConaughy, of Wesleyan University:

The committees have considered the historical development of these bodies, their aims and emphases, and the needs and desires of the fields in which they function; and also the problem presented by the existence of two separate organizations serving in the main a common constituency and drawing their support from institutions in a large measure identical.

The committees have had before them the action of the Council of Church Boards of Education, proposing the creation of a Committee of Six, consisting of two members each from the Council, the Association of American Colleges, and the Liberal Arts College Movement, as a fact-finding group to determine the interrelationships, functions, and programs of the three organizations.

The committees recognize clearly the importance of the considerations which led to this proposal upon the part of the Council, and believe that in view of the direct interest of the Council in the whole problem of affiliation, their participation in the negotiations is appropriate and advisable.

Your committees present the following as their common report:

1. We recognize the desirability of a coordination of the functions and, if possible, a unification of the organizations of the two bodies.

2. In negotiations looking toward that end, account needs to be taken of the aims and ideals of each body. It appears to be essential that along with the continuation of that service in the field of educational leadership which has been carried on so well by the Association of American Colleges, provision must be made for an ample program of promotion on behalf of liberal arts education and liberal arts colleges along the general lines which have been followed by the Liberal Arts College Movement.

3. Upon the basis of the above general statement of interests to be conserved, we recommend to each of the bodies we represent the approval of the proposal of the Council of Church Boards of Education, and the appointment by the President of the Association of American Colleges of two



members upon this Committee of Six, their report and recommendations to be presented as soon as possible to the Association of American Colleges, which alone shall have power to act for the Association.

These recommendations were referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

The meeting adjourned at four o'clock, so that the delegates might visit the art exhibit at the Cincinnati Art Museum which Mr. Siple had specially arranged for those attending the Association meeting.

### *Third Session*

The annual dinner of the Association was held in the Hall of Mirrors of the Netherland Plaza, Thursday evening, January 21, at 7:00 o'clock, with the President of the Association presiding.

A musical program, including both vocal and instrumental numbers, was rendered by students of the Cincinnati Conservatory of Music.

The new presidents and acting presidents who had been elected since the last annual meeting were presented by the Associate Secretary of the Association, Mr. Archie M. Palmer, and welcomed by the President of the Association.

The Executive Secretary read a message from Principal L. P. Jacks, of Manchester College, England.

On the suggestion of the President of the Association, it was

*Voted*, That the Executive Secretary of the Association transmit to President Mary Emma Woolley, of Mount Holyoke College, the greetings and best wishes of the Association of American Colleges in her work in Geneva as a member of the International Disarmament Conference.

[Later the following radio message was sent by the Executive Secretary:

"The Association of American Colleges, by unanimous vote, extends confidence and best wishes on your great mission."]

The guest of honor, Mr. Charles P. Taft, II, was presented and spoke on "Education and Depression."

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 22

*Fourth Session*

The fourth session of the meeting, held in the Hall of Mirrors of the Netherland Plaza, was called to order by President Wilkins at 9:45 o'clock, Friday morning, January 22.

The Committee on Resolutions, through its chairman, President Edmund D. Soper, of Ohio Wesleyan University, recommended the adoption of the following resolutions, which considered seriatim, were all adopted.

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Association that the Commission on the Enlistment and Training of College Teachers proceed to the preparation of a book, or booklet, for the benefit of undergraduates contemplating college teaching, provided that funds can be secured to cover the cost of preparing and distributing such a publication.

*Resolved*, That the report on the Classification of Institutions of Higher Education be accepted in principle and that a committee of the Association be appointed with power to assign the institutions to their respective places and that this committee report their assignments to the Association and to such other educational associations as can make proper use of this material.

An organization has arisen within the last two years entitled "The Liberal Arts College Movement." This Movement serves to a considerable extent a common constituency and draws its support from the same institutions as the Association of American Colleges. The conviction that the relations between these two organizations should be clarified and defined is shared by many members of both. To this end the suggestion has been made by the Council of Church Boards of Education that a committee should be created of six members, two each from the Council of Church Boards of Education, the Liberal Arts College Movement, and this Association, to act as a fact-finding group to determine the interrelationships, functions, and programs of the three organizations. In accordance with this suggestion, your Committee presents the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That this Association authorize the appointment by the President of two members upon the Committee of Six, their report and recommendations to be presented as soon as possible to the Association, which Association alone shall have power to act for the Association.

The President of the Association announced the appointment of President Donald J. Cowling, of Carleton College, and Presi-

dent James L. McConaughy, of Wesleyan University, as the two representatives of the Association of American Colleges on that Committee of Six.

The Vice-President of the Association, Registrar John P. Mitchell, of Stanford University, proposed the following By-law, which upon motion was adopted:

These By-laws may be amended at any business meeting of the Association by two-thirds vote, notice of the proposed amendment having been presented at a previous session.

The Committee on Nominations, through its chairman, President W. G. Clippinger, of Otterbein College, placed before the Association the nominations of officers and members of the Executive Committee and of the Permanent Commissions and Committees. It was

*Voted*, That the report of the Committee on Nominations be accepted and that the Secretary be instructed to cast the unanimous vote of the Association accordingly.

The Secretary having cast that vote, the following officers and members of the Executive Committee and of the Permanent Commissions and Committees of the Association were declared elected for the year ending January, 1933:

*President*: President Irving Maurer, Beloit College

*Vice-President*: President Frank L. McVey, University of Kentucky

*Executive Secretary*: Dr. Robert L. Kelly, New York City

*Associate Secretary*: Mr. Archie M. Palmer, New York City

*Treasurer*: President William Mather Lewis, Lafayette College

*Custodian of Funds*: Bank of New York and Trust Company, New York City

*Additional Members of the Executive Committee:*

President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College

President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University

President William P. Few, Duke University

Dean William Cunningham, College of St. Thomas

*For the Standing Committees:*

*American Council on Education:*

President Guy E. Snavey, Birmingham-Southern College (one year)

President J. Edgar Park, Wheaton College, Massachusetts (two years)

Chancellor S. P. Capen, University of Buffalo (three years)

*National Advisory Committee on Education:*

President William M. Lewis, Lafayette College, *Chairman*

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, Association of American Colleges  
President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College  
President R. E. Blackwell, Randolph-Macon College  
Rector James H. Ryan, The Catholic University of America

*National Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Learning:*

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, *Chairman*  
Professor Floyd Reeves, The University of Chicago  
President E. E. Rall, North Central College  
Assistant Secretary J. C. Christensen, University of Michigan  
Controller G. C. Wintringer, Princeton University  
Professor E. S. Evenden, Teachers College, Columbia University  
President George F. Zook, University of Akron

*National Research Council:*

Professor Arthur H. Compton, University of Chicago, 1932-33

*Commission on College Architecture and College Instruction in Fine Arts:*

President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, *Chairman*  
President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation  
President John Erskine, Juilliard School of Music  
Mr. J. Fredrick Larson, Dartmouth College  
President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College  
Sister Anna Goulet, College of St. Catherine

*Commission on the Cost of College Education:*

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, *Chairman*  
Controller C. C. Wintringer, Princeton University  
Controller Lloyd Morey, University of Illinois  
Auditor N. C. Plimpton, The University of Chicago  
Secretary Alex. H. Sands, Jr., The Duke Endowment  
Auditor T. L. Hungate, Teachers College, Columbia University  
President G. B. Oxnam, DePauw University

*Commission on Educational Surveys:*

President David A. Robertson, Goucher College, *Chairman*  
President George F. Zook, University of Akron  
Executive Secretary M. C. Huntley, Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States

*Commission on the Enlistment and Training of College Teachers:*

President Albert Britt, Knox College, *Chairman*  
President James B. Angell, Yale University  
President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College  
President Homer P. Rainey, Bucknell University  
President L. W. Boe, St. Olaf's College

*Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship:*

President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College, *Chairman*  
Dean C. S. Boucher, The University of Chicago  
Dean Julian Park, University of Buffalo  
President Clifton D. Gray, Bates College  
President Katharine Blunt, Connecticut College

*Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds:*

Dr. Alfred W. Anthony, New York City, *Chairman*  
Treasurer Charles T. Brown, Swarthmore College  
President Rees E. Tulloss, Wittenberg College  
Assistant Treasurer Raymond L. Thompson, University of Rochester  
President James R. McCain, Agnes Scott College

*Commission on Athletics:*

President Thomas S. Gates, University of Pennsylvania, *Chairman*  
President Daniel L. Marsh, Boston University  
President William M. Lewis, Lafayette College  
President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College  
Acting President John L. Newcomb, University of Virginia

*Committee on Form of Classification of Institutions of Higher Education:*

Dean Raymond Walters, Swarthmore College, *Chairman*  
Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, University of Buffalo  
Dr. F. J. Kelly, United States Office of Education

The Special Committee appointed to study the question of college entrance credit for Chinese and Japanese languages, through its chairman, Dean John R. Effinger, of the University of Michigan, reported on its study of the question and presented the following recommendation, which upon motion was adopted.

That the Association of American Colleges recommends:

1. That two or more units of Chinese or Japanese be included in the list of subjects accepted for college admission.
2. That each college approving this recommendation indicate in its catalogue the manner in which these units will be accepted.

Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, of Columbia University, presented a report on "The Work of the Committee on Personnel of the American Council on Education."

Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, of the University of Buffalo, presented a paper on "Vital Educational Measures Applicable to Colleges."

The President of the Association introduced Dr. Edward S. Jones, who is directing the Comprehensive Examination Study; Professor Homer L. Dodge, delegate from the American Association of University Professors; Miss Kathryn McHale, Executive Secretary of the American Association of University Women; and Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, Director of the Institute of International Education.

The outgoing President of the Association then presented the new President of the Association, President Irving Maurer, of Beloit College.

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 o'clock.

#### *Luncheon Conferences*

The following sectional luncheon conferences convened at 12:30 o'clock under the chairmanship of the leaders indicated. Upon the completion of these conferences the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges adjourned *sine die*.

*Credits and Credit Systems:* President William M. Lewis, Lafayette College

*Objective Indices of Faculty Scholarship Obtainable Through the Library:* President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College

*Standard Financial Reports:* Assistant Secretary J. C. Christensen, University of Michigan

*Faculty and Student Relationships:* Dean Christian Gauss, Princeton University, and President Katharine Blunt, Connecticut College

*Individualization in Teaching:* President Homer P. Rainey, Bucknell University

*The Comprehensive Examination:* Dr. Edward S. Jones, Director of Special Study

*Financial and Fiduciary Matters:* Dr. Alfred W. Anthony.

(Signed)

ARCHIE M. PALMER

*Associate Secretary*



## MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, 1932

The Association of American Colleges is not a standardizing agency. Election to membership does not involve any kind of academic status except that stipulated in the *By-Laws* of the Association. By order of the Association, in the case of universities the unit of membership is the university college of liberal arts. Unless otherwise indicated the name of the president or the chancellor is given in the column headed Executive Officer.

INSTITUTION	EXECUTIVE OFFICER
-------------	-------------------

### ALABAMA

Alabama College, Montevallo.....	O. C. Carmichael
Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham.....	Guy E. Snavely
Howard College, Birmingham.....	Theophilus R. Eagles, <i>Acting</i>
Judson College, Marion.....	L. G. Cleverdon
Spring Hill College, Spring Hill.....	Joseph M. Walsh
Talladega College, Talladega.....	Frederick A. Sumner
Woman's College of Alabama, Montgomery.....	W. D. Agnew

### ARIZONA

University of Arizona, Tucson.....	Homer Le Roy Shantz
------------------------------------	---------------------

### ARKANSAS

Arkansas College, Batesville.....	Ury McKenzie
Hendrix College, Conway.....	J. H. Reynolds
Onachita College, Arkadelphia.....	Charles D. Johnson
College of the Ozarks, Clarksville.....	Wiley Lin Hurie

### CALIFORNIA

#### Claremont Colleges

Pomona College, Claremont.....	Charles K. Edmunds
Scripps College, Claremont.....	E. J. Jaqua
Dominican College, San Rafael.....	Sister M. Raymond, <i>Dean</i>
College of the Holy Names, Oakland.....	Sister Mary Austin, <i>Dean</i>
Immaculate Heart College, Hollywood.....	Sister Margaret Mary
La Verne College, La Verne.....	Ellis M. Studebaker
Mills College, Mills College.....	Aurelia H. Reinhardt
Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles.....	Sister Mary Dolorosa
Occidental College, Los Angeles.....	Remsen duBois Bird
College of the Pacific, Stockton.....	Tully C. Knoles
University of Redlands, Redlands.....	V. Leroy Duke
St. Mary's College, Oakland.....	Brother Z. Leo
University of Southern California, Los Angeles.....	R. B. Von KleinSmid

Stanford University, Stanford University.....	Robert E. Swain, <i>Acting</i>
Whittier College, Whittier.....	W. F. Dexter

#### COLORADO

Colorado College, Colorado Springs.....	Charles C. Mierow
University of Denver, Denver.....	Fred M. Hunter
Loretto Heights College, Loretto.....	Sister M. Edmond Fern

#### CONNECTICUT

Albertus Magnus College, New Haven.....	Sister M. Isabel
Connecticut College, New London .....	Katharine Blunt
Trinity College, Hartford.....	Remsen B. Ogilby
Wesleyan University, Middletown.....	J. L. McConaughy

#### DELAWARE

University of Delaware, Newark.....	Walter Hullihen
-------------------------------------	-----------------

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The American University, Washington.....	George B. Woods, <i>Dean</i>
The Catholic University of America, Washington.....	James H. Ryan
George Washington University, Washington.....	C. H. Marvin
Georgetown University, Washington.....	Coleman Nevils
Howard University, Washington.....	Mordecai W. Johnson
Trinity College, Washington.....	Sister Julia of the Trinity

#### FLORIDA

Florida State College, Tallahassee.....	Edward Conradi
John B. Stetson University, Deland.....	Lincoln Hulley
Rollins College, Winter Park.....	Hamilton Holt
Southern College, Lakeland.....	Ludd M. Spivey

#### GEORGIA

Agnes Scott College, Decatur.....	James R. McCain
Brenau College, Gainesville.....	H. J. Pearce
Emory University, Emory University.....	Harvey W. Cox
Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville.....	J. L. Beeson
Georgia State Woman's College, Valdosta.....	R. H. Powell
University of Georgia, Athens.....	C. M. Snelling
Mercer University, Macon.....	Spright Dowell
Morehouse College, Atlanta.....	Samuel H. Archer
Piedmont College, Demorest.....	Henry C. Newell
Shorter College, Rome.....	W. D. Furry
Spelman College, Atlanta.....	Florence M. Read
Wesleyan College, Macon.....	Dice R. Anderson

#### IDAHO

Gooding College, Wesleyan.....	Charles W. Tenney
College of Idaho, Caldwell.....	W. J. Boone

ILLINOIS

Augustana College, Rock Island.....	Gustav A. Andreen
Aurora College, Aurora.....	O. R. Jenks
Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria.....	F. R. Hamilton
Carthage College, Carthage.....	Jacob Diehl
University of Chicago, Chicago.....	C. S. Boucher, <i>Dean</i>
DePaul University, Chicago.....	Francis V. Corcoran
Eureka College, Eureka.....	Clyde L. Lyon
Greenville College, Greenville.....	Leslie R. Marston
Illinois College, Jacksonville.....	Charles H. Rammelkamp
Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington.....	Wm. J. Davidson
Knox College, Galesburg.....	Albert Britt
Lake Forest College, Lake Forest.....	H. M. Moore
Loyola University, Chicago.....	Thomas Egan, <i>Dean</i>
MacMurray College, Jacksonville.....	Clarence P. McClelland
McKendree College, Lebanon.....	Cameron Harmon
Millikin University, Decatur.....	Jesse H. White
Monmouth College, Monmouth.....	T. H. McMichael
Mount Morris College, Mount Morris.....	C. Ernest Davis
North Central College, Naperville.....	E. E. Rall
Northwestern University, Evanston.....	Walter Dill Scott
Rockford College, Rockford.....	William A. Maddox
Rosary College, River Forest.....	Sister Mary Ruth
St. Viator College, Bourbonnais.....	J. W. P. Maguire
St. Xavier College for Women, Chicago.....	Mother M. Sophia Mitchell
Shurtleff College, Alton.....	George M. Potter
Wheaton College, Wheaton.....	James O. Buswell
Y. M. C. A. College, Chicago.....	Edward C. Jenkins

INDIANA

Butler University, Indianapolis.....	Walter S. Athearn
DePauw University, Greencastle.....	Garfield B. Oxnam
Earlham College, Richmond.....	William C. Dennis
Evansville College, Evansville.....	Earl E. Harper
Franklin College, Franklin.....	Robert H. Kent, <i>Acting</i>
Hanover College, Hanover.....	Albert G. Parker, Jr.
Indiana Central College, Indianapolis.....	I. J. Good
Indiana University, Bloomington.....	Wm. L. Bryan
Manchester College, North Manchester.....	Otho Winger
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame.....	Chas. L. O'Donnell
Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute.....	Donald P. Prentice
St. Mary's of Notre Dame, Notre Dame.....	Sister Irma
St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary of the Woods,	
	Mother Mary Raphael, <i>Acting</i>
Taylor University, Upland.....	Robert L. Stuart
Wabash College, Crawfordsville.....	L. B. Hopkins

## IOWA

Central College, Pella.....	John Wesselink
Clarke College, Dubuque.....	Sister Mary Clara Russell
Coe College, Cedar Rapids.....	Harry M. Gage
Columbia College, Dubuque.....	Thomas Conry, <i>Acting</i>
Cornell College, Mt. Vernon.....	Herbert J. Burgstahler
Drake University, Des Moines.....	Daniel W. Morehouse
University of Dubuque, Dubuque.....	Paul H. Buchholz
Grinnell College, Grinnell.....	John S. Nollen
Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant.....	James E. Coons
Luther College, Decorah.....	Oscar L. Olson
Morningside College, Sioux City.....	Robert E. O'Brian
Parsons College, Fairfield.....	Clarence W. Greene
Penn College, Oskaloosa.....	H. Clark Bedford
St. Ambrose College, Davenport.....	Martin Cone
Simpson College, Indianola.....	John L. Hillman
Western Union College, Le Mars.....	D. O. Kime, <i>Acting</i>

## KANSAS

Baker University, Baldwin City.....	Wallace B. Fleming
Bethany College, Lindsborg.....	Ernest F. Pihlblad
College of Emporia, Emporia.....	John B. Kelly
Friends University, Wichita.....	W. O. Mendenhall
Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina.....	L. B. Bowers
McPherson College, McPherson.....	V. F. Schwalm
Ottawa University, Ottawa.....	Warren P. Behan, <i>Acting</i>
Southwestern College, Winfield.....	Frank E. Mossman
Sterling College, Sterling.....	Ross T. Campbell
Washburn College, Topeka.....	Philip C. King
University of Wichita, Wichita.....	Harold W. Foght

## KENTUCKY

Asbury College, Wilmore.....	L. R. Akers
Berea College, Berea.....	W. J. Hutchins
Centre College, Danville.....	Charles J. Turck
Georgetown College, Georgetown.....	Henry E. Watters
University of Kentucky, Lexington.....	P. P. Boyd, <i>Dean</i>
University of Louisville, Louisville.....	R. A. Kent
Nazareth College, Louisville.....	Sister Berenice, <i>Dean</i>
Transylvania College, Lexington.....	Arthur Braden
Union College, Barbourville.....	John Owen Gross

## LOUISIANA

Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport.....	George S. Sexton
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston.....	Geo. W. Bond
Loyola University, New Orleans.....	John W. Hynes
Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette.....	Edwin L. Stephens

**MAINE**

Bates College, Lewiston.....	Clifton D. Gray
Bowdoin College, Brunswick.....	Kenneth C. M. Sills
Colby College, Waterville.....	Franklin W. Johnson
University of Maine, Orono.....	Harold S. Boardman

**MARYLAND**

Goucher College, Baltimore.....	David A. Robertson
Hood College, Frederick.....	Joseph H. Apple
Loyola College, Baltimore.....	Henri J. Wiesel
University of Maryland, College Park.....	Raymond A. Pearson
Morgan College, Baltimore.....	John O. Spencer
College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore.....	Sister M. Ethelbert
St. John's College, Annapolis.....	Douglas H. Gordon
St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg.....	Sister Paula
Washington College, Chestertown.....	Paul E. Titsworth
Western Maryland College, Westminster.....	A. N. Ward

**MASSACHUSETTS**

Amherst College, Amherst.....	Arthur S. Pease
Boston College, Boston.....	Louis J. Gallagher
Boston University, Boston.....	Daniel L. Marsh
Clark College, Worcester.....	Wallace W. Atwood
Harvard University, Cambridge.....	A. Lawrence Lowell
Holy Cross College, Worcester.....	John M. Fox
International Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield.....	L. L. Doggett
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley.....	Mary Emma Woolley
Radeliffe College, Cambridge.....	Ada L. Comstock
Simmons College, Boston.....	Henry Lefavour
Smith College, Northampton.....	W. A. Neilson
Tufts College, Tufts College.....	John A. Cousens
Wellesley College, Wellesley.....	Ellen F. Pendelton
Wheaton College, Norton.....	J. Edgar Park
Williams College, Williamstown.....	Harry A. Garfield
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester.....	Ralph Earle

**MICHIGAN**

Adrian College, Adrian.....	Harlan L. Feeman
Albion College, Albion.....	John L. Seaton
Alma College, Alma.....	Harry Means Crooks
Battle Creek College, Battle Creek.....	Paul F. Voelker
Colleges of the City of Detroit, Detroit.....	Wilford L. Coffey, <i>Dean</i>
University of Detroit, Detroit.....	John P. McNichols
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale.....	Wm. Gear Spencer
Hope College, Holland.....	Wynand Wichers
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo.....	Allan Hoben
Marygrove College, Detroit.....	George Hermann Derry

Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, East Lansing.....	Robert S. Shaw
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.....	John R. Effinger, <i>Dean</i>
Olivet College, Olivet.....	James King

#### MINNESOTA

Augsburg College, Minneapolis.....	George Sverdrup
Carleton College, Northfield.....	D. J. Cowling
Concordia College, Moorhead.....	J. N. Brown
Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter.....	O. J. Johnson
Hamline University, St. Paul.....	Alfred F. Hughes
Macalester College, St. Paul.....	John C. Acheson
College of St. Catherine, St. Paul.....	Sister Antonia
St. Olaf College, Northfield.....	L. W. Boe
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth.....	Sister M. Agnes
College of St. Teresa, Winona.....	Sister Mary A. Molloy, <i>Dean</i>
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul.....	Matthew Schumacher

#### MISSISSIPPI

Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain.....	Lawrence T. Lowrey
Millsaps College, Jackson.....	David M. Key
Mississippi College, Clinton.....	D. M. Nelson
Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus.....	R. E. L. Sutherland
University of Mississippi, University.....	Joseph N. Powers

#### MISSOURI

Central College, Fayette.....	Robert H. Ruff
Culver-Stockton College, Canton.....	John Hepler Wood
Drury College, Springfield.....	T. W. Nadal
Lindenwood College, St. Charles.....	John L. Roemer
Maryville College, St. Louis.....	Mother Mary Gilmore
University of Missouri, Columbia.....	Walter Williams
Missouri Valley College, Marshall.....	George H. Mack
Park College, Parkville.....	F. W. Hawley
St. Louis University, St. Louis.....	Robert S. Johnston
Tarkio College, Tarkio.....	Robert N. Montgomery
Washington University, St. Louis.....	George R. Throop
Webster College, Webster Groves.....	George F. Donovan
Westminster College, Fulton.....	M. E. Melvin
William Jewell College, Liberty.....	John F. Herget

#### MONTANA

Intermountain Union College, Helena.....	Wendell S. Brooks
--	-------------------

#### NEBRASKA

Cotner College, Lincoln.....	L. C. Anderson
Creighton University, Omaha.....	Patrick J. Mahan



Doane College, Crete.....	Edwin B. Dean
Hastings College, Hastings.....	Calvin H. French
Midland College, Fremont.....	H. F. Martin
Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln.....	I. B. Schreckengast
York College, York.....	J. R. Overmiller

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Dartmouth College, Hanover.....	Ernest M. Hopkins
University of New Hampshire, Durham.....	E. M. Lewis

**NEW JERSEY**

Georgian Court College, Lakewood.....	Mother Mary John
The New Jersey College for Women, New Brunswick,	
	Mabel S. Douglass, <i>Dean</i>
Princeton University, Princeton.....	Luther P. Eisenhart, <i>Dean</i>
Rutgers University, New Brunswick.....	Robert C. Clothier
College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station.....	Sister Marie José, <i>Dean</i>
Upsala College, East Orange.....	Carl G. Erickson

**NEW MEXICO**

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.....	J. F. Zimmerman
--	-----------------

**NEW YORK**

Adelphi College, Garden City.....	Frank D. Blodgett
Alfred University, Alfred.....	Boothe C. Davis
University of Buffalo, Buffalo.....	Samuel P. Capen
Canisius College, Buffalo.....	Rudolph J. Eichhorn
Clarkson College, Potsdam.....	Joseph Eugene Rowe
Colgate University, Hamilton.....	George B. Cutten
Columbia University	
Barnard College, New York.....	Virginia C. Gildersleeve, <i>Dean</i>
Columbia College, New York.....	Herbert E. Hawkes, <i>Dean</i>
St. Stephen's College, Annandale-on-Hudson.....	B. I. Bell, <i>Warden</i>
Cornell University, Ithaca.....	Robert M. Ogden, <i>Dean</i>
D'Youville College, Buffalo.....	Mother Saint Edward, <i>Acting</i>
Elmira College, Elmira.....	Frederick Lent
Fordham University, New York.....	Aloysius J. Hogan
Good Counsel College, White Plains.....	Mother M. Aloysia
Hamilton College, Clinton.....	Frederick C. Ferry
Hobart College, Geneva.....	Murray Bartlett
Keuka College, Keuka Park.....	A. H. Norton
Manhattan College, New York.....	Brother Cornelius
Marymount College, Tarrytown-on-Hudson.....	Sister M. Gerard
College of the City of New York, New York.....	F. B. Robinson
College of Mt. St. Vincent, New York.....	Sister Miriam Alacoque, <i>Dean</i>
Nazareth College, Rochester.....	Sister Teresa Marie, <i>Acting</i>
College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle.....	John P. Chidwick

New York University, New York.....	Marshall S. Brown, <i>Dean</i>
Niagara University, Niagara Falls.....	John J. O'Byrne
University of Rochester, Rochester.....	Rush Rhees
Russell Sage College, Troy.....	J. L. Meader
College of the Sacred Heart, Manhattanville.....	Grace C. Dammann
Saint Bonaventure's College, Saint Bonaventure.....	Thomas Plassman
St. John's College, Brooklyn.....	Thomas F. Ryan
St. Joseph's College for Women, Brooklyn.....	William T. Dillon, <i>Dean</i>
St. Lawrence University, Canton.....	Richard E. Sykes
College of St. Rose, Albany.....	Sister M. Gonzaga, <i>Dean</i>
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs.....	Henry T. Moore
Syracuse University, Syracuse.....	Charles W. Flint
Union College, Schenectady.....	Frank P. Day
United States Military Academy, West Point.....	William R. Smith
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie.....	H. N. MacCracken
Wagner College, Staten Island.....	Herman Brezing
Wells College, Aurora.....	Kerr D. Macmillan

## NORTH CAROLINA

Catawba College, Salisbury.....	Howard R. Omwake
Davidson College, Davidson.....	Walter L. Lingle
Duke University, Durham.....	W. P. Few
Elon College, Elon College.....	L. E. Smith
Guilford College, Guilford College.....	Raymond Binford
Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte.....	H. L. McCrorey
Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory.....	H. E. Schaefer
Meredith College, Raleigh.....	C. E. Brewer
North Carolina College for Negroes, Durham.....	James E. Shepard
Salem College, Winston-Salem.....	H. E. Rondthaler
Wake Forest College, Wake Forest.....	Thurman D. Kitchin

## NORTH DAKOTA

Jamestown College, Jamestown.....	B. H. Kroeze
-----------------------------------	--------------

## OHIO

University of Akron, Akron.....	George F. Zook
Antioch College, Yellow Springs.....	Arthur E. Morgan
Ashland College, Ashland.....	Edwin E. Jacobs
Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea.....	Albert B. Storms
Bluffton College, Bluffton.....	S. K. Mosiman
Capital University, Columbus.....	Otto Mees
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati.....	Herman Schneider
University of Dayton, Dayton.....	Bernard P. O'Reilly
Defiance College, Defiance.....	W. Vernon Lytle
Denison University, Granville.....	A. A. Shaw
Heidelberg College, Tiffin.....	Charles E. Miller
Hiram College, Hiram.....	Kenneth I. Brown

John Carroll University, Cleveland.....	B. J. Rodman
Kenyon College, Gambier.....	William F. Peirce
Lake Erie College, Painesville.....	Vivian B. Small
Marietta College, Marietta.....	Edward S. Parsons
Miami University, Oxford.....	Alfred H. Upham
College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St. Joseph.....	Sister Mary Zoe, <i>Dean</i>
Mount Union College, Alliance.....	W. H. McMaster
Muskingum College, New Concord.....	J. Knox Montgomery, Jr., <i>Acting</i>
Notre Dame College, South Euclid.....	Mother Mary Evarista
Oberlin College, Oberlin.....	Ernest H. Wilkins
Ohio Northern University, Ada.....	Robert Williams
Ohio University, Athens.....	E. B. Bryan
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware.....	Edmund D. Soper
Otterbein College, Westerville.....	W. G. Clippinger
St. John's College, Toledo.....	Gerald A. Fitzgibbons
University of the City of Toledo, Toledo.....	Henry J. Doermann
Ursuline College, Cleveland.....	Mother M. Eulalia
Western College for Women, Oxford.....	Ralph K. Hickok
Western Reserve University, Cleveland.....	R. E. Vinson
Wilberforce University, Wilberforce.....	Gilbert H. Jones
Wilmington College, Wilmington.....	Oscar F. Boyd, <i>Acting</i>
Wittenberg College, Springfield.....	Rees E. Tulloss
College of Wooster, Wooster.....	C. F. Wishart
Xavier College, Cincinnati.....	Hugo F. Sloctemyer

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater.....	H. G. Bennett
Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee.....	W. C. Boone
Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City.....	Eugene M. Antrim
Oklahoma College for Women, Chickasha.....	M. A. Nash
Phillips University, East End.....	I. N. McCash
University of Tulsa, Tulsa.....	John D. Finlayson

OREGON

Albany College, Albany.....	Thomas W. Bibb
Linfield College, McMinnville.....	W. R. Frerichs, <i>Acting</i>
Pacific University, Forest Grove.....	John F. Dobbs
Reed College, Portland.....	N. F. Coleman
Willamette University, Salem.....	Carl G. Doney

PENNSYLVANIA

Albright College, Reading.....	W. F. Teel
Allegheny College, Meadville.....	William P. Tolley
Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr.....	Marion Edwards Parks
Bucknell University, Lewisburg.....	Homer P. Rainey
Dickinson College, Carlisle.....	Karl T. Waugh
Drexel Institute, Philadelphia.....	R. C. Disque, <i>Dean</i>

Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster.....	Henry Harbaugh Apple
Geneva College, Beaver Falls.....	McLeod M. Pearce
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg.....	Henry W. A. Hansom
Grove City College, Grove City.....	Weir C. Ketler
Haverford College, Haverford.....	W. W. Comfort
Immaculata College, Immaculata.....	Anthony J. Flynn
Juniata College, Huntingdon.....	Charles C. Ellis
Lafayette College, Easton.....	William Mather Lewis
LaSalle College, Philadelphia.....	Brother E. Alfred
Lebanon Valley College, Annville.....	G. D. Gossard
Lehigh University, Bethlehem.....	Charles Russ Richards
Lincoln University, Lincoln University.....	Wm. H. Johnson
Marywood College, Scranton.....	Mother M. Joseph Hurley
Moravian College, Bethlehem.....	William N. Schwarze
Moravian College for Women, Bethlehem.....	Edwin J. Heath
Mount St. Joseph College, Chestnut Hill.....	Mother M. James
Muhlenberg College, Allentown.....	John A. W. Haas
St. Vincent College, Latrobe.....	Alfred Koch
Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh.....	Cora H. Coolidge
Pennsylvania State College, State College.....	R. D. Hetzel
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.....	Thomas S. Gates
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.....	John G. Bowman
Rosemont College, Rosemont.....	Mother Mary Ignatius
St. Francis College, Loretto.....	P. J. Sullivan, <i>Acting</i>
St. Thomas College, Scranton.....	Brother D. Edward
Seton Hill College, Greensburg.....	James A. W. Reeves
Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove.....	G. Morris Smith
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore.....	Frank Aydelotte
Temple University, Philadelphia.....	Charles E. Beury
Thiel College, Greenville.....	E. Clyde Xander
Ursinus College, Collegeville.....	George L. Omwake
Villanova College, Villanova.....	James H. Griffin
Washington and Jefferson College, Washington.....	Ralph C. Hutchison
Waynesburg College, Waynesburg.....	Paul R. Stewart
Westminster College, New Wilmington.....	Robert F. Galbreath
Wilson College, Chambersburg.....	Ethelbert D. Warfield

#### RHODE ISLAND

Brown University, Providence.....	Clarence A. Barbour
Providence College, Providence.....	Lorenzo C. McCarthy

#### SOUTH CAROLINA

College of Charleston, Charleston.....	Harrison Randolph
Clemson College, Clemson College.....	E. W. Sikes
Coker College, Hartsville.....	Carlyle Campbell
Converse College, Spartanburg.....	R. P. Pell

Erskine College, Due West.....	Robert C. Grier
Furman University, Greenville.....	W. J. McGlothlin
Limestone College, Gaffney.....	R. C. Granberry
Newberry College, Newberry.....	James C. Kinard
Presbyterian College, Clinton.....	John McSween
University of South Carolina, Columbia.....	Leonard T. Baker, <i>Acting</i>
Winthrop College, Rock Hill.....	James P. Kinard
Wofford College, Spartanburg.....	Henry N. Snyder

SOUTH DAKOTA

Augustana College, Sioux Falls.....	O. J. H. Preus
Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell.....	Earl A. Roadman
Huron College, Huron.....	R. C. Agne
Yankton College, Yankton.....	George W. Nash

TENNESSEE

Carson and Newman College, Jefferson City.....	James T. Warren
University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga.....	Alexander Guerry
Cumberland University, Lebanon.....	Ernest L. Stockton
Fisk University, Nashville.....	Thomas E. Jones
Knoxville College, Knoxville.....	J. Kelly Giffen
Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate.....	H. Artis Miley, <i>Acting</i>
Maryville College, Maryville.....	Ralph W. Lloyd
Milligan College, Milligan.....	H. J. Derthick
University of the South, Sewanee.....	B. F. Finney
Southwestern, Memphis.....	Charles E. Diehl
Tusculum College, Greeneville.....	Charles A. Anderson
Union University, Jackson.....	Arthur W. Prince, <i>Acting</i>
Vanderbilt University, Nashville.....	J. H. Kirkland

TEXAS

Austin College, Sherman.....	E. B. Tucker
Baylor College for Women, Belton.....	John C. Hardy
Baylor University, Waco.....	William S. Allen, <i>Acting</i>
Bishop College, Marshall.....	Joseph J. Rhoads
Howard Payne College, Brownwood.....	Thomas H. Taylor
Incarinate Word College, San Antonio.....	Mother M. Columkille
Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio.....	H. A. Constantineau
Rice Institute, Houston.....	E. O. Lovett
Simmons University, Abilene.....	Jefferson D. Sandefer
Southern Methodist University, Dallas.....	Charles C. Selecman
Southwestern University, Georgetown.....	King Vivion
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth.....	E. M. Waits
Texas State College for Women, Denton.....	L. H. Hubbard
Texas Technological College, Lubbock.....	P. W. Horn
Trinity University, Waxahachie.....	J. H. Burma

## UTAH

Brigham Young University, Provo.....	F. S. Harris
University of Utah, Salt Lake City.....	George Thomas

## VERMONT

Middlebury College, Middlebury.....	Paul D. Moody
Norwich University, Northfield.....	Charles H. Plumley

## VIRGINIA

Bridgewater College, Bridgewater.....	Paul H. Bowman
Emory and Henry College, Emory.....	J. N. Hillman
Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney.....	J. D. Eggleston
Hollins College, Hollins.....	M. Estes Cooke, <i>Dean</i>
Lynchburg College, Lynchburg.....	J. T. T. Hundley
Mary Baldwin College, Staunton.....	L. Wilson Jarman
Randolph-Macon College, Ashland.....	R. E. Blackwell
Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg.....	N. A. Pattillo, <i>Acting</i>
University of Richmond, Richmond.....	F. W. Boatwright
Roanoke College, Salem.....	Charles J. Smith
Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar.....	Meta Glass
Virginia Military Institute, Lexington.....	John A. Lejeune
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg.....	Julian A. Burruss
Virginia Union University, Richmond.....	William J. Clark
University of Virginia, Charlottesville.....	John L. Newcomb, <i>Acting</i>
Washington and Lee University, Lexington.....	Francis P. Gaines
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg.....	J. A. C. Chandler

## WASHINGTON

Gonzaga University, Spokane.....	John J. Keep
College of Puget Sound, Tacoma.....	Edward H. Todd
Whitman College, Walla Walla.....	S. B. L. Penrose

## WEST VIRGINIA

Bethany College, Bethany.....	Cloyd Goodnight
Davis and Elkins College, Elkins.....	James E. Allen
Salem College, Salem.....	S. O. Bond
West Virginia State College, Institute.....	John W. Davis
West Virginia University, Morgantown.....	John R. Turner
West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon.....	Roy McCusky

## WISCONSIN

Beloit College, Beloit.....	Irving Maurer
Carroll College, Waukesha.....	Wm. Arthur Ganfield
Lawrence College, Appleton.....	Henry M. Wriston
Marquette University, Milwaukee.....	Wm. M. Magee
Milton College, Milton.....	Jay W. Crofoot
Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee.....	Lucia B. Briggs



Mount Mary College, Milwaukee.....	Edward A. Fitzpatrick
Northland College, Ashland.....	J. D. Brownell
Ripon College, Ripon.....	Silas Evans

**HONORARY MEMBERS**

American Association for the Advancement of Science  
American Association of University Professors  
American Association of University Women  
American Council of Learned Societies  
American Council on Education  
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching  
Carnegie Corporation  
General Education Board  
Institute of International Education  
National Research Council  
Rockefeller Foundation  
Social Science Research Council  
United States Office of Education  
Council of Church Boards of Education and its constituent Boards

## CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

**T**HE purpose of the Association shall be the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges which shall become members of this Association, and the prosecution of such plans as may make more efficient the institutions included in its membership.

*Name:* The name of this Association shall be the "Association of American Colleges."

*Membership:* All colleges which conform to the definition of a minimum college given in the By-Laws may become members of this Association. The general secretaries of church boards of education and officials of educational foundations and other cooperating agencies may be elected to honorary membership.

*Representation:* Every institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to representation in each meeting of the Association by an accredited representative. Other members of the faculty or board of trustees of any institution belonging to this Association, the officers of church boards cooperating with such an institution and the representatives of foundations and other cooperating agencies, shall be entitled to all the privileges of representatives except the right to vote. Each institution recognized as a member of the Association shall be entitled to one vote on any question before the Association, the vote to be cast by its accredited representative.

*Officers:* The Association shall elect a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer, who shall be charged with the duties usually connected with their respective offices. The Secretary shall be the permanent executive officer of the Association, and shall serve without term until his successor is elected. The other officers shall serve for one year, or until their successors are duly elected. The Association shall also elect four others who, with the four officers named above, shall constitute the Executive Committee of the Association. The President of the Association shall be *ex-officio* chairman of the Executive Committee. The election of officers shall be by ballot.

*Meetings:* At least one meeting of the Association shall be held in each calendar year. Special meetings may be called by the

Executive Committee, provided that four weeks' notice be given each institution connected with the Association. Representatives of twenty-five members of the Association shall be necessary to form a quorum for the transaction of business.

*By-Laws:* The Association may enact By-Laws for its own government not inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution.

*Vacancies:* The Executive Committee is authorized to fill vacancies *ad interim* in the offices of the Association.

*Amendments:* Amendments to the foregoing Constitution may be offered at any regular annual meeting, and shall be in writing, signed by the mover and two (2) seconds. They shall then lie on the table until the next annual meeting, and shall require for their adoption the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members then present.

#### BY-LAWS

1. In order to be eligible to membership in this Association institutions shall require fifteen units for admission to the freshman class and 120 semester hours, or an equivalent, for graduation.

2. Applications for membership shall be made to the Executive Committee, which shall, after investigation of the standing of the institution, recommend to the Association.

3. The annual dues shall be fifty dollars per member. Non-payment of dues for two successive years shall cause forfeiture of membership.

4. The place of the annual meeting of the Association shall be determined each year by the Executive Committee.

5. All expenditure of the funds of the Association shall be authorized by the Association, or, subject to later approval by the Association, by the Executive Committee.

6. The President shall appoint a Committee on Resolutions at the beginning of each annual meeting, to which shall be referred for consideration and recommendation all special resolutions offered by members of the Association.

7. The Secretary is authorized to mail three copies of all official bulletins to all institutions which are members of the Association. Additional subscriptions, either for the institution or for any officer or faculty member, may be made at a special rate.

8. These By-laws may be amended at any business session of the Association by two-thirds vote, notice of the proposed amendment having been presented at a previous session.

### POLICY

In accordance with the action of the Association, the working policy of the Association is a policy of *inclusiveness and inter-helpfulness rather than of exclusiveness.*

Adopted as revised January 22, 1932.

---

### FORMER PRESIDENTS

- 1915 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College; *Constitution adopted*
- 1915-16 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College
- 1916-17 President Henry Churchill King, Oberlin College
- 1917-18 President John S. Nollen, Lake Forest College
- President Hill M. Bell,\* Drake University, *Vice-President, presiding*
- 1918-19 President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College
- 1919-20 President William A. Shanklin,\* Wesleyan University
- 1920-21 President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College
- 1921-22 President Clark W. Chamberlain, Denison University
- 1922-23 President Charles A. Richmond, Union College
- President Samuel Plantz,\* Lawrence College, *Vice-President, presiding*
- 1923-24 President Harry M. Gage, Coe College
- 1924-25 Chancellor J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University
- 1925-26 President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College
- 1926-27 Dean John R. Effinger, University of Michigan
- 1927-28 President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College
- 1928-29 President Trevor Arnett, General Education Board
- 1929-30 President Guy E. Snavely, Birmingham-Southern College
- 1930-31 Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University
- 1931-32 President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College

\* Deceased

## RESPONSIBILITY OF AN EDUCATED DEMOCRACY

It is obvious that learning is no longer the privilege of the favored few, and still we persist in emphasizing the privileges of the educated and neglect to consider their responsibilities. If this policy is not reversed we may well raise a question as to the social effectiveness of our universal system of education. Certain it is that improvement in public welfare, in political integrity, in moral stamina, has not kept pace with the amazing increase in the general participation in educational facilities. Knowledge has not invariably blossomed into wisdom.

If educated men and women will awake to their responsibility, if in every commonwealth and community, in every college and civic organization, there could be organized commissions to make thorough and impartial investigations of conditions near at home, the results would be immediate and lasting. The call for educated men and women to assume their evident responsibilities as citizens is strikingly clear.

The responsibility of the educated in the matter of the proper use of leisure should also be considered. Improved methods of production have shortened the working day and given the worker greater leisure. With this, comes the foolish spending of money. The educated leaders must popularize the public libraries and art museums. It is the obligation of the educated to inculcate in the uneducated "the ability to fill his leisure time with refreshing and inspiring things."—*William Mather Lewis*.

We realize that a liberal education is a discipline of body, mind and spirit, a discipline which is not individual only but also communal. Our eyes have been opened to the truth that the angle of a liberal education subtends the arc of life from the nursery to old age.

The realization of a liberal education is delayed by selfishness, by fear of competition, by color prejudice, by defects of method, and by lack of money and of peace.

The communal benefits of a liberal education are rashly taken for granted. The liberally educated man is detached from the common lot, unduly fastidious, absorbed in rather selfish study, a little frightened by the rough and tumble of practical life.

The English liberal education is strong in fostering habits of corporate life. In a great crisis we Americans cooperate, but in the daily round and trivial tasks of city life we seem to muddle along more than we should if we really enjoyed cooperation.

# APPENDIX

## The Number and Quality of College Graduates Entering the Profession of College Teaching

List I: Colleges accredited by the Association of American Universities, 1930 (126)

College	I	II		III	
	No. of grads. with Bachelor degrees	No. engaged in or preparing for college teaching		No. of these (II) in upper quarter of class or otherwise of high standing	
<b>ALABAMA</b>		%		%	
Birmingham-Southern .....	1,012	56	5.5	32	57.0
Howard .....	872	22	2.5	21	95.0
<b>ARKANSAS</b>					
Hendrix .....	490	41	8.4	35	85.0
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>					
Mills .....	828	19	2.3	5	26.0
Occidental .....	984	11 <sup>1</sup>	1.1	1	9.1
Pacific, College of the .....	540 <sup>2</sup>	27	5.0	17	63.0
Pomona .....	1,623	99	6.1	73	73.0
Redlands, University of .....	629	38	6.0	24	63.0
<b>COLORADO</b>					
Colorado College .....	790	47	6.0	11	23.0
Denver, University of .....	1,936 <sup>3</sup>	102	5.3	35	34.0
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>					
Connecticut College for Women	851	18	2.1	8	44.0
Trinity .....	347	15	4.3	4	27.0
Wesleyan University .....	1,048	130	12.5	79	61.0
<b>DELAWARE</b>					
Delaware, University of .....	922	20	4.6	8	40.0
<b>FLORIDA</b>					
State College for Women .....	1,389	43	3.1	33	77.0
<b>GEORGIA</b>					
Agnes Scott .....	796	72	9.0	30	41.6
Emory University .....	945	83	8.3	42	50.6
Wesleyan College .....	636	14	2.2	5	36.0
<b>ILLINOIS</b>					
Carthage .....	415	34	8.2	34	100.0
Eureka .....	338	24	7.1	12	50.0
Illinois College .....	443	28	6.3	17	61.0
Illinois Wesleyan University .....	753	43	5.6	18	42.0
Knox .....	930	49	5.3	34	69.0
Lake Forest .....	318	24	7.5	13	54.0
MacMurray (Illinois Woman's)	326	24	7.3	11	45.0
Monmouth .....	640	29	4.5	22	76.0
North Central .....	881	37	4.2	28	76.0



College	I	II	III
		%	%
<b>ILLINOIS (continued)</b>			
Rockford .....	443	15 3.4	9 60.0
Rosary .....	306	37 12.1	24 65.0
Wheaton .....	630	36 5.7	22 61.0
<b>INDIANA</b>			
De Pauw University .....	2,222	148 6.7	104 70.2
Earlham .....	779	32 <sup>1</sup> 4.1	11 34.0
Franklin .....	548	23 4.2	21 91.0
Indiana University .....	3,610	209 5.8	31 14.8
Rose Polytechnic Institute .....	394	6 1.5	5 83.0
<b>IOWA</b>			
Coe .....	1,178	72 6.1	55 76.0
Columbia .....	468	32 6.8	27 84.0
Cornell .....	1,014	65 6.4	23 35.0
Drake University .....	1,389	52 3.7	17 32.7
<b>KANSAS</b>			
Washburn .....	976	60 6.1	28 46.7
<b>KENTUCKY</b>			
Center .....	349	23 6.6	16 69.5
Kentucky, University of .....	1,474	85 5.8	21 24.7
<b>MAINE</b>			
Bates .....	1,201	55 4.5	22 40.0
Bowdoin .....	904	49 5.5	32 65.0
Colby .....	1,091	37 3.4	26 70.3
<b>MARYLAND</b>			
Goucher .....	1,902	81 4.2	42 52.0
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>			
Clark University .....	434 <sup>4</sup>	32 <sup>1</sup> 7.4	19 59.0
Holy Cross .....	1,920	14 0.72	10 71.0
Radcliffe .....	1,291	53 4.1	21 39.8
Tufts .....	1,531	36 2.6	20 55.0
Wellesley .....	3,388	99 <sup>1</sup> 2.9	40 40.4
Wheaton .....	725	44 6.1	31 70.4
Williams .....	1,335	27 2.0	13 48.3
Worcester Polytechnic Inst. ...	799	17 2.1	9 53.0
<b>MICHIGAN</b>			
Albion .....	963	35 3.6	14 40.0
Kalamazoo .....	552	25 4.5	12 48.0
<b>MINNESOTA</b>			
Carleton .....	1,238	75 <sup>1</sup> 6.1	33 44.0
Macalester .....	729	15 2.1	10 66.0
St. Catherine .....	476	36 7.6	28 77.6
St. Olaf .....	1,705	93 5.5	42 45.0
St. Teresa .....	337	41 12.1	41 100.0
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>			
Millsaps .....	521	49 9.4	26 53.0

College	I	II	III
		%	%
<b>MISSOURI</b>			
Drury .....	511	40 7.8	19 47.5
Park .....	662	58 8.8	45 77.6
Westminster .....	237	18 7.6	14 77.8
William Jewell .....	594	42 7.1	13 31.0
<b>NEBRASKA</b>			
Doane .....	244	30 12.2	20 66.7
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b>			
New Hampshire, University of (College of Liberal Arts) ...	1,311	45 3.4	14 31.0
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>			
Rutgers University (College of Arts and Sciences) .....	1,027	31 <sup>1</sup> 3.0	17 54.9
St. Elizabeth, College of .....	527	29 5.5	14 48.2
<b>NEW YORK</b>			
Alfred University .....	623	21 3.4	15 71.4
Barnard .....	2,017	99 4.9	41 41.4
Buffalo, University of .....	823	37 4.5	18 48.6
College of the City of New York .....	5,147	104 <sup>1</sup> 2.0	40 38.4
Cornell University .....	3,600	121 3.4	72 59.4
Elmira .....	1,050	45 4.4	8 17.8
Hamilton .....	696	50 7.2	25 50.0
New York University (College of Arts and Pure Sciences) <sup>s</sup> .....	1,097	48 4.3	25 25.0
St. Lawrence University .....	974	15 1.5	11 73.3
St. Stephen's .....	138	14 10.1	14 100.0
Union .....	1,183	33 2.8	33 100.0
Vassar .....	2,515	93 3.7	59 63.4
Wells .....	474	32 6.8	13 40.6
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>			
Davidson .....	924	66 7.2	23 34.8
Duke University .....	1,582	51 <sup>1</sup> 3.2	51 100.0
Meredith .....	497	29 5.8	8 27.8
<b>OHIO</b>			
Akron, University of .....	497	22 4.4	12 54.5
Heidelberg .....	606	24 4.0	11 45.8
Hiram .....	559	15 <sup>1</sup> 2.7	9 60.0
Kenyon .....	320	19 5.9	15 78.9
Marietta .....	516	35 6.8	18 51.4
Miami University .....	922	84 9.1	29 34.5
Mount Union .....	710	41 5.7	31 75.7
Oberlin .....	2,421	254 10.5	67 26.4
Ohio Wesleyan University .....	3,031	147 4.8	31 21.0
Otterbein .....	823	52 6.3	22 42.4
Western .....	497	20 4.0	3 15.0
Western Reserve University (Flora Stone Mather Col- lege) .....	1,479	11 .7	5 45.4
Wooster .....	1,369	78 5.7	45 57.7

College	I	II	III
		%	%
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>			
Oklahoma College for Women	488	45 9.2	15 33.4
<b>OREGON</b>			
Reed .....	377	63 16.7	32 50.8
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>			
Allegheny .....	1,030	48 4.7	27 56.3
Franklin & Marshall .....	932	28 3.0	13 46.5
Gettysburg .....	1,026	47 4.5	19 40.5
Lafayette .....	1,629	20 1.2	10 50.0
Muhlenberg .....	895	14 1.6	7 50.0
Swarthmore .....	1,088	21 1.9	21 100.0
Ursinus .....	592	28 4.7	17 60.7
Westminster .....	630	19 3.0	13 68.4
Wilson .....	760	11 1.5	10 90.9
<b>RHODE ISLAND</b>			
Brown University .....	3,149	172 5.5	136 79.1
<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>			
Converse .....	596	60 10.1	48 80.0
Wofford .....	706	35 5.0	35 100.0
<b>TEXAS</b>			
Our Lady of the Lake .....	226	11 4.9	10 90.9
Texas Christian University .....	1,023	56 5.5	44 78.6
<b>UTAH</b>			
Brigham Young University.....	1,079	61 5.7	22 36.0
Utah, University of .....	2,967	41 1.4	19 46.3
<b>VERMONT</b>			
Middlebury .....	1,136	12 1.1	8 66.6
<b>VIRGINIA</b>			
Randolph-Macon .....	289	20 7.0	13 65.0
Randolph-Macon Woman's .....	1,315	32 2.4	15 47.0
Richmond University .....	1,018	65 6.4	27 41.6
Sweet Briar .....	556	34 6.1	9 26.4
<b>WASHINGTON</b>			
Whitman .....	727	62 8.5	46 74.0
<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>			
Bethany .....	477	21 4.4	11 52.0
<b>WISCONSIN</b>			
Lawrence .....	1,052	56 5.3	30 53.5
Ripon .....	724	30 4.2	21 70.0
Total .....	129,194	6,022 4.6	3,145 52.2

<sup>1</sup> Does not include those preparing for college teaching.

<sup>2</sup> Does not include Bachelor of Music Graduates.

<sup>3</sup> Does not include Bachelor of Commercial Science Graduates (3 years' work).

<sup>4</sup> Does not include 62 Bachelors of Education.

<sup>5</sup> Includes only those alumni concerning whom positive information is available. Returns believed to be very much understated.—Dean M. S. Brown.

*List II: Colleges Accredited by Regional Standardizing Associations, 1930 (95)*

College	I	II	III
		%	%
<b>ALABAMA</b>			
Alabama .....	569	35 6.2	24 67.5
Judson .....	400	7 1.8	3 42.8
Woman's College of Alabama .....	618	12 1.9	10 83.3
<b>ARKANSAS</b>			
Ouachita .....	422	22 5.2	9 40.9
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>			
St. Mary's .....	233	12 5.2	9 75.0
<b>COLORADO</b>			
Loretto Heights .....	125	38 <sup>1</sup> 30.4	34 89.5
<b>GEORGIA</b>			
Brenau .....	341	10 2.9	6 60.0
Shorter* .....	367	5 <sup>2</sup> 1.4	2 40.0
<b>IDAHO</b>			
Idaho, College of .....	413	12 2.9	6 50.0
<b>ILLINOIS</b>			
Bradley Polytechnic Institute* .....	684	14 <sup>2</sup> 2.0	11 78.6
McKendree .....	212	11 5.2	6 54.5
Milliken University .....	608	22 3.6	22 100.0
Shurtleff .....	275	21 7.6	21 100.0
<b>INDIANA</b>			
Butler University .....	1,823	66 3.6	27 40.9
Evansville .....	289	19 6.6	5 26.3
Hanover .....	372	8 2.2	3 37.5
St. Mary's of Notre Dame .....	321	3 <sup>2</sup> .9	3 100.0
St. Mary-of-the-Woods .....	300	25 8.3	25 100.0
<b>IOWA</b>			
Dubuque, University of .....	285	19 6.7	13 63.4
Luther .....	492	58 11.8	22 37.9
Parsons .....	515	30 5.8	18 60.0
Penn .....	523	48 9.2	31 64.7
<b>KANSAS</b>			
Emporia .....	566	45 8.0	19 42.2
Friends University .....	463	20 4.3	5 25.0
Ottawa University .....	314	52 16.5	18 34.6
Wichita, University of .....	663	61 9.2	25 41.0
<b>LOUISIANA</b>			
Centenary .....	372	14 3.8	7 50.0
Loyola University .....	346	22 6.4	22 100.0
Southwestern Louisiana Institute .....	633	43 6.8	19 44.2
<b>MARYLAND</b>			
Hood .....	681	9 1.3	1 11.1
Notre Dame of Maryland .....	169	8 4.7	4 50.0
St. Joseph's .....	176	4 2.3	4 100.0
Washington .....	258	4 1.6	4 100.0
Western Maryland .....	683	15 2.2	5 33.3

College	I	II	III
		%	%
<b>MICHIGAN</b>			
Alma .....	324	31 9.6	24 72.4
Hope .....	775	76 9.8	38 50.0
<b>MINNESOTA</b>			
Concordia .....	532	23 <sup>2</sup> 4.3	12 52.2
Gustavus Adolphus .....	704	17 2.4	7 41.1
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>			
Blue Mountain .....	341	17 5.0	9 53.0
Mississippi .....	783	63 8.1	41 61.5
Mississippi State College for Women .....	1,953	40 <sup>2</sup> 2.0	29 72.5
<b>MISSOURI</b>			
Culver Stockton .....	220	16 7.3	15 93.7
Lindenwood .....	238	23 9.7	17 73.9
Tarkio .....	264	28 10.1	24 85.7
Webster .....	137	9 6.6	8 88.8
<b>NEBRASKA</b>			
Hastings .....	514	36 7.0	30 83.4
Nebraska Wesleyan .....	849	69 8.1	64 92.8
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>			
New Mexico, University of .....	515	24 4.7	10 41.7
<b>NEW YORK</b>			
Adelphi .....	1,079	7 <sup>2</sup> .6	6 85.7
D'Youville .....	335	4 1.2	4 100.0
College of the Sacred Heart.....	267	10 3.7	10 100.0
Mount St. Vincent .....	674	30 4.4	30 100.0
Russell Sage .....	563	2 .3	2 100.0
St. Bonaventure .....	556	104 <sup>3</sup> 18.8	52 50.0
St. John's (Brooklyn) .....	652	29 4.5	3 10.4
Skidmore .....	649	16 2.5	4 25.0
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>			
Elon .....	442	25 5.7	14 56.0
Guilford .....	314	27 8.6	20 74.2
North Carolina College for Women .....	2,028	33 1.8	33 100.0
Salem .....	311	9 2.9	8 88.8
<b>OHIO</b>			
Antioch .....	368	16 4.4	9 56.3
Baldwin-Wallace* .....	529	23 4.4	18 78.3
Capital University .....	371	31 8.4	17 54.9
Muskingum .....	1,242	60 4.8	6 10.0
<b>OREGON</b>			
Albany .....	85	5 5.9	4 80.0
Pacific University .....	251	22 8.8	10 45.4
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>			
Grove City .....	873	20 2.3	16 80.0
Juniata .....	555	25 4.5	17 68.0

College	I	II	III
		%	%
<b>PENNSYLVANIA (continued)</b>			
Lebanon Valley .....	596	25 4.2	15 60.0
Marywood .....	784	50 6.4	37 74.1
Pennsylvania College for Women .....	486	20 4.1	9 45.0
Susquehanna University .....	810	10 1.2	1 10.0
<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>			
The Citadel .....	644	27 4.2	18 66.6
Coker .....	392	13 3.3	11 84.6
Limestone .....	280	9 3.2	9 100.0
Presbyterian .....	323	14 4.3	13 92.8
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>			
Huron .....	269	25 9.7	19 76.0
Yankton .....	315	39 12.6	39 100.0
<b>TENNESSEE</b>			
Fisk University .....	567	93 16.4	30 32.3
Maryville .....	785	37 4.7	15 40.6
Southwestern .....	291	12 4.1	3 25.0
<b>TEXAS</b>			
Simmons University .....	909	130 14.3	64 49.3
Southwestern University .....	736	47 6.4	19 40.4
Trinity University .....	626	22 3.5	6 27.3
<b>VIRGINIA</b>			
Bridgewater .....	304	26 8.6	13 50.0
Emory & Henry .....	437	12 2.8	4 33.3
Hampden-Sydney .....	258	19 7.4	16 84.3
Lynchburg .....	283	14 .5	12 85.7
Roanoke .....	314	28 8.9	12 42.8
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	1,406	48 3.4	21 43.8
<b>WASHINGTON</b>			
College of Puget Sound .....	401	13 3.3	7 53.8
<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>			
West Virginia Wesleyan .....	513	24 4.7	7 29.2
<b>WISCONSIN</b>			
Carroll* .....	468	15 3.2	9 60.0
Marquette* .....	859	38 4.4	19 50.0
Omega** .....	1,087	36 3.3	12 33.4
<b>Total</b> .....	50,947	2,613 5.1	1,494 56.2

\* This college was accredited by the Association of American Universities in November, 1931.

\*\* Report received without signature. Included here inasmuch as data for both men and women were carefully prepared and submitted on the blank furnished to Association members, on the policy of "inclusiveness."

<sup>1</sup> Many of these students are members of the teaching community, Sisters, who after receiving the A.B. degree have gone on with higher work preparatory for college teaching.

<sup>2</sup> Does not include those preparing for college teaching.

<sup>3</sup> The figures include a considerable number of seminarians, priests and nuns who teach in college either before, during or after the time they receive their degrees. Some of those have taken regular classes here, while others have completed their work in extension.



## List III: Other Institutions (29)

College	I	II	III
		%	%
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>			
La Verne .....	393	12 3.6	10 83.3
<b>FLORIDA</b>			
John B. Stetson University .....	316	10 3.2	7 70.0
<b>GEORGIA</b>			
Piedmont .....	216	24 11.1	11 45.8
<b>IDAHO</b>			
Gooding .....	115	8 5.3	7 87.5
<b>ILLINOIS</b>			
Aurora .....	145	6 4.1	5 83.3
Greenville .....	349	42 12.1	19 45.3
Mount Morris .....	180	9 5.0	5 55.6
St. Viator .....	136	30 22.1	26 86.7
St. Xavier College for Women .....	90	9 10.0	9 100.0
<b>INDIANA</b>			
Indiana Central .....	393	17 4.3	11 64.7
Manchester .....	840	20 2.4	12 60.0
<b>IOWA</b>			
Buena Vista .....	149	6 4.0	3 50.0
Western Union .....	192	15 7.8	9 60.0
<b>KANSAS</b>			
Bethany .....	256	24 9.4	19 79.2
McPherson .....	563	33 5.9	19 57.6
<b>MICHIGAN</b>			
Adrian .....	178	11 6.2	10 90.9
<b>MONTANA</b>			
Intermountain Union .....	182	11 6.0	9 81.8
<b>NEBRASKA</b>			
Cotner .....	252	18 7.1	11 61.11
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>			
Upsala .....	223	21 9.4	17 80.9
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>			
Johnson C. Smith University .....	222	23 10.4	19 82.6
<b>OHIO</b>			
Defiance .....	311	8 2.6	6 75.0
St. John's College .....	149	14 9.4	14 100.0
Wilmington .....	595	44 7.4	40 90.9
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>			
St. Francis .....	216	13 6.0	13 100.0
<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>			
Newberry .....	509	20 3.9	18 90.0

College	I	II	III
		%	%
<b>TENNESSEE</b>			
Cumberland University .....	229	19 8.3	14 73.7
<b>TEXAS</b>			
Howard Payne .....	430	25 5.8	17 68.0
<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>			
Davis & Elkins .....	192	16 8.3	12 75.0
Salem .....	279	20 7.2	9 45.0
<b>Total</b> .....	8,300	528 6.4	381 72.1

### PALMER VISITS COLLEGES

At the close of the annual meeting Associate Secretary Archie M. Palmer spent several weeks visiting member colleges in Kentucky, Georgia, and South Carolina. At the colleges he spoke in chapel, met with the college faculties for the discussion of recent developments in college education, and conferred with administrative officers and others.

The colleges visited included Centre College, University of Louisville, Asbury College, University of Kentucky and Berea College in Kentucky; Agnes Scott College, Spelman College and Piedmont College in Georgia; Clemson College, Wofford College, Converse College, Newberry College and Coker College in South Carolina.

Mr. Palmer also addressed the Association for the Promotion of Christian Education at Danville, Kentucky, and the Association of Georgia Colleges and the Georgia Association of Negro Colleges in Atlanta, Georgia.

==

—

7

0

0

0

1

—

ry  
ces  
he  
on  
th

of  
ea  
ge  
ol-  
in

on  
ia-  
ro